SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS

DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

DLEI ng

THE MDay

TRUE GROUNDS

OF

[PARKER (Henry)]

Eccleſiaſticall Regiment

Wing P428

SET FORTH

In a breife Diſſertation.

Maintaining the Kings ſpirituall ſupremacie againſt the Pretended Independencie of the PRELATES, &c.

TOGETHER,

With ſome paſſages touching the Eccleſiaſticall Power of Parliaments, the uſe of Synods, and the Power of Excommunication.

LONDON,
Printed for *Robert Boſtock*.
1641.

AC911.164J.P37

The Divine Right of Episcopacie refuted.

IN this Controversie about Episcopacie by reason of many mistakes of either side much time hath beene spent to little purpose, and the right and truth is yet as farre imbosked, and buried in darkenesse as ever it was. Me thinks, the case is, as if two well imbattail'd Armies had marched forth for a mutuall encounter, but both not taking the same way, there never was yet any meeting in any one certain place, where this great strife might bee decided. These mistakes and misadventures on both sides, as I conceive, have happened for want of an exact, and adequate definition of Episcopacie first set downe, and agreed upon by both, and then by both equally pursued. It shall be therefore my care at this time to begin with a definition of Episcopacy, and that such a one, as I shall take out of Bishop *Hall*, one of the greatest asserters, and in that the noblest, of Episcopacy: and that which hee indevours to maintaine as being of Divine right, I according to my power shall indeavour to disprove.

The first definition given by the same Bishop is

this ; *Epiſcopacy is an holy Order of Church-government, for the adminiſtration of the Church.* This definition I hold to be too large, and unadequate for the determining of this doubt, for *Calvins* diſcipline may according to this definition be called Epiſcopacy, and it may be affirmed that Epiſcopacie has bin in all ages; ſince God had never yet any Church, wherein was not ſome holy Order of Church diſcipline for better ruling of the ſame. And by the way, I muſt here profeſſe to ſhake off, and neglect the mentioning, or anſwering of any thing which the Patrons of Epiſcopacie have alledged, and ſtuft their volumes withall, in defence of Order, and diſparity in the Church; for let our Adverſaries be never ſo clamorous in this point, yet it is manifeſt, that no Church was ever yet ſo barbarous as to plead for anarchy, or a meere equalitie, neither did *Calvin* ever favour any ſuch parity as was inconſiſtent with Order and government, neither do we ſee any ſuch confuſion introduced into *Geneva* it ſelfe, as our Hierarchiſts ſeem to gainſay. To let paſſe all impertinent vagaries, our diſpute muſt be not whether Church politie be neceſſary, or no; but whether that Church policy which is now exerciſed in *England* be neceſſary, & unalterable, or no. And not whether ſuch parity as is the mother of Confuſion be politique, or no ; but whether ſuch parity as now is at *Geneva* amongſt presbyters be politique, or no: but my preſent ſcope is not to defend the Presbyteriall diſcipline in all things, it is only to maintain againſt the neceſſity of ſuch an immutable Epiſcopacy, as is now conſtituted in *England*, & ſo far to defend parity, as our Hierarchiſts

rarchists take advantage against it, for the upholding of their own side. To this purpose I cānot chuse but say, that in nature that seems to be the best parity which admits of some disparity in Order, and that seems to be the best disparity which prevents confusion with the most parity. And therefore we see that our Saviour recommended as unlordly a disparity as might be, not unlike that of marriage, for there is a great and sweet parity in the tie of Wedlocke between man and wife, and that is not maintained without some disparity, yet that disparity is as little as may be, and that only for parities sake, *Non aliter fuerint fœmina virq; pares.* But of this no more; I come to Bishop *Halls* next more exact definitions: and they run thus; *Episcopacy is an Eminent Order of sacred function appointed in the Evangelicall Church by the Holy Ghost, for the governing and overseeing thereof, and besides the Word and Sacraments, it is indued with power of Ordination and perpetuity of jurisdiction.* Or thus: *A Pastor ordained perpetuall moderator in Church affaires with a fixed imparity exercising spirituall jurisdiction out of his owne peculiarly demandated authority is a Bishop.* Or thus: *Adde majority above Presbyters, and power of jurisdiction by due Ordination for constant continuance, and this makes a Bishop: take away these, and he remaines a meere Presbyter.*

It is to bee observed now that foure things are here asserted.

First, Episcopall power is such as none are capable of, but only men within Sacred Orders. A Bishop must be a Presbyter indued with power of Ordination, and spirituall jurisdiction by due Ordination, and without these hee remaines a meere Pastor.

Secondly, Episcopall power is such as is wholly independent upon temporall Rulers, Its institution was from the Holy Ghost in the Evangelicall Church, It must rule out of its owne peculiarly demandated authority.

Thirdly, Episcopal power consists in Ordination, and spiritual jurisdiction, and in majority above Presbyters.

Fourthly, Episcopal power is unalterable by any temporal authority, it is perpetual by divine right, As it was fixed, and where it was settled by Christ, and his immediate successors, so and there it must continue unchanged til the worlds end.

In briefe, the summe of all these definitions is this: *Episcopacy is a forme of Ecclesiasticall policy instituted by Christ, whereby a Superiour Order of Presbyters is indued with a perpetual independent power of Ordination, and spiritual jurisdiction, and with majority above Presbyters, and this power as it appertaines to all that Order, so it appertaines only to that Order.*

And those things which we oppose herein are chiefly two; First, we see no ground in the word of God, why Bishops should arrogate to themselves such a peculiar, independent, perpetual power of Ordination, spirituall jurisdiction, and such a majority above Presbyters, as now they injoy, excluding from all such power and majoritie, not only all Laymen, and Princes, but also Presbyters themselves. Secondly, if power of Ordination, and spirituall jurisdiction, and preheminence above all the Clergie bee due only to Bishops, yet we complaine that now in *England* that power and preheminence is abused, and too farre extended, and to such purposes perverted, as the Apostles never

ver practiſed or intended. Of theſe two points in this Order: but for my part, I am no favourer of extreames, ſome defend Epiſcopacie as it is now conſtituted in *England*, as Apoſtolicall, others withſtand it as Antichriſtian: my opinion is that the government is not ſo faulty as the Governours have beene, and that it is better then no government at all; nay, and may be better then ſome other forms which ſome Sectaries have recommended to the World. And my opinion further is, that it is not alike in all reſpects, and that it ought to be ſeverally examined and ventilated, and that ſo it will probably appeare in ſome things unprofitable, in ſome things inconvenient, in ſome things miſchievous: in nothing neceſſary, or unalterable. And it ought to be obſerved, that evill formes of policie have been ſometimes well ordered and rectified by good Commanders: and ſo the State of *Boetia* once flouriſhed under *Epaminondas* and *Pelopidas*, and yet it owed this proſperitie not to the government of the Citie, for that was ill conſtituted, and compoſed: but to the Governours, for they were wiſe and vertuous. The contrary alſo happened to *Lacedæmon*, for that fared ill ſometimes and ſuffered much diſtemper, becauſe though its fundamentall Laws were good, yet its Kings and Ephorie were many times tyrannous, and unjuſt. And this ſhould teach Biſhops not alwayes to boaſt of the ſanctitie of their Order: becauſe ſuch, & ſuch, in ancient, and modern times were Martyrs, or were humble, and fortunate to the Church, nor always to blame all other formes of government, for the faults of ſuch

& ſuch Governors. But in this my enſuing diſcourſe I muſt undertake almoſt all Churchmen, at leaſt ſome, if not all, of all Religions, & opinions. Papiſts allow ſomthing to ſecular Magiſtrates in the rule of the Church, but Supremacie of rule they do utterly in very terms deny. The Proteſtants though divided amongſt themſelvs, ſome placing ſupreme power in Epiſcopacie, others in presbytery, yet both in effect deny it to the King, though in words they pretend otherwiſe. The grounds of this miſtake (as I conceive) are theſe; when our Saviour firſt gave commiſſion to his Diſciples to preach, and baptiſe, and to propagate the true faith in the World, Secular authority being then adverſe thereunto, Hee was of neceſsity to commit, not only doctrine but all diſcipline alſo to the charge of his Apoſtles, and their Subſtitutes only: Wherfore though Secular authority be now come in, & become friendly to Religion, & willing to advance the ſpirituall proſperity of the Church, aſwel as the temporall of the State, yet Clergiemen having obtained poſſeſsion of power in the Church, and that by Chriſts own inſtitution, they think they ought not to reſigne the ſame againe at the demand of Princes. And becauſe the certain forme of diſcipline which our Saviour left, and to whom it was left is doubtfully and obſcurely ſet forth in Scripture, and is yet controverted of all ſides, therefore ſome contend for one thing, ſome for an other, but all agree in this, that whatſoever forme was appointed for thoſe times, is unalterably neceſſary for theſe, and that to whomſoever rule was deſigned, to Chriſtian Princes it was

not

not,my drift therefore must now be,to discover the erroneous conceits herein of all sides,and to doe as the *Romans* once did when they were chosen arbitrators betweene two contesting Cities, I must neither decree for the Plaintiff, nor Defendant,but for the King, who is in this case a third party. I am of opinion that some order and imparitie was necessary in the Primitive Church, in the very House of God, and therefore was so countenanced by our Saviour: but for ought I see,that power which was then necessary was not so large as our Prelates, nor so narrow as our Presbyterians plead for,but whatsoever it was,or whereſoever it rested,questionless, it is now unknown, and not manifest in Scripture: but if it were manifest, and that such as the Prelacie, or such as the Presbytery mayntaines, it is so far from being now unchangeable since Princes are come in to doe their offices in the house of God, that I think it cannot remayne unchanged without great injury to Princes, and damage to the Church, and by consequence great dishonour to our Saviour. And this is that now which I shall endevour to confirme, and demonstrate, In the first place then, I am to impugne those grounds *whereby a sole, independent, perpetuall power of Church Government is appropriated to Ecclesiasticall persons only: and whereby Princes, &c. are excluded as incompetent for the same.* That there is no such thing as Ordination, and spirituall Jurisdiction due,and necessary in the Church is not now to be questioned, the question is what persons are most capable of the same, whether such as are commonly called Ecclesiasticall, or no. It is agreed by all, that God hath not left Humane nature

ture deſtitute of ſuch remedies as are neceſſary to its conſervation: and that rule and dominion being neceſſary to that conſervation, where that rule and dominion is granted, there all things neceſſary for the ſupport of that rule and dominion are granted too. It is further agreed alſo that Supream power ought to be intire and undivided, and cannot elſe be ſufficient for the protection of all, if it doe not extend overall: without any other equall power to controll, or diminiſh it: and that therefore the Supreme Temporall Magiſtrate ought in ſome caſes to command Eccleſiaſticall perſons, as well as Civill: but here lies the difference, the Papiſts hold, that though ſpirituall perſons as they are men, and Citizens of the Common-wealth in regard of their worldly habitation are ſubject to temporall Commanders, yet this ſubjection is due *ob pacem communem*, or *quoad commune bonum*, and that *per accidens* and *indirectè*, and that no further neither, but only *ſecundum partem directivam*, *ſeu imperativam*. Thus, whatſoever they pretend to the contrary, they doe erect *regnum in regno*, they give temporall Monarchie an imperfect, broken right in ſome things, but controlable and defeaſible by the ſpirituall Monarchie in other things. And the World ha's had a long ſad experience of this, whilſt Kings had the Pope for their ſuperiour in any thing, they remayned Supreame in nothing, whil'ſt their rule was by diviſion diminiſhed in ſome things, they found it inſufficient in all things, ſo that they did not command joyntly with the Pope, but were commanded wholly by the Pope. And in Popiſh Countries now Princes do ſuffer themſelves in word to be excluded

cluded from all ſpirituall Dominion, and execute not the ſame in ſhew but by ſubordinate Clerks under them, and that by privilege of the Popes grant, but we know in truth they hold it, and uſe it as their own, and the Pope is more officious to them, then they are to him. And whereas the Canon Law allows temporall Princes to puniſh the inſolence and oppreſsions of Biſhops within their reſpective Territories, *modò ſint veræ oppreſsiones*, wee know this comes to nothing, if Princes claime it not by ſomthing higher then Canon Law. For how ſhall this be tryde? how ſhall it appeare, whether theſe oppreſsions be true, and hainous, or no? if Biſhops will not ſubmit themſelves in this tryall, and refuſe to appeale, Kings are no competent Judges, nor can take no juſt cognizance hereof: and what redreſſe then is in the Kings power? Even Popiſh Princes now know well enough how ridiculous this favour of the Canoniſts is, & therfore as the Popes fed thē heretofore with the name and ſhadow only of painted Sovereignty in *temporalibus*; ſo they feed him the like now in *ſpiritualibus*. Proteſtants diſſent much from theſe Tenets, but becauſe many of them, eſpecially Clergimen do not wholly diſſent from all the grounds of theſe Tenets, therefore they alſo doe partake in ſome errours, and abſurdities of the like nature: One *Scotiſt* ſays, *That* Mountague, *and our learnedeſt Proteſtant Divines, nay, even* Rainolds *himſelfe though otherwiſe a Puritan, yet they all hold, that there is due to the King, no ſpirituall but only a temporall rule over perſons and cauſes Eccleſiaſticall, and that alſo by accident for the common peace ſake.* Hee

C ſayes,

ſayes alſo *that in his preſence at a* Cambridge *Commencement, the chiefe* Biſhop *was called* Maximus Pater, *and that it was maintained that the care of ſpirituall things did appertain to the chiefe* Biſhop, *and of temporall to the King, and whereas it was at laſt concluded that all was to be governed by the King,* yet he ſayes *queſtionleſſ the intent was civiliter, not ſpiritualiter.* And if wee look back to the primitives we ſhal find that in good times before Popery had any conſiderable growth Kings for penance were enjoyned to kneele to Prieſts, and were not admitted to have ſeats in the Chancell neere the Altar, no not amongſt the Deacons: but were ſometimes ſubjected to heavie and ſharp cenſures of Biſhops, and ſometimes ſtrucke with the thunderbolt of Excommunication it ſelf. And we ſhall find that the Name Church was applyed in common ſpeech to Churchmen only, and the Name *Spiritualitie* was taken in the ſame ſenſe, as if all other perſons had beene ſtrangers to the Church, and had beene of a meere Temporall and Secular condition: and by the name Clergie it was intimated to the World, that the *Sacerdotall* function was the only lot and patrimony of God: and theſe uſages were *ab antiquo*. And wee ſhall finde that the holieſt and learnedeſt Fathers of the Church did ſeeme to preferre the Mitre before the Diademe, and to dream of a Spirituall Empire belonging to Prieſts more worthy and ſacred then that of Emperours. And therefore *Gregory* of *Nazianzen* in a Sermon before the Emperour ſays thus to him: *The Law of Chriſt hath committed you to my Charge, and to my Pulpit: for we rule alſo and ours is a more*

more excellent and perfect regiment. And comparing further the rule of Priests with the rule of Princes, *Hee cals the one spirituall the other fleshly, and concludes that the spirit ought not to give place to the flesh, nor heavenly things to earthly.* What hee meant here by giving place, whether hee meant it of externall submission, or internall awe I cannot tell: but he left it uncertain. To the same purpose that of *Ambrose* tends also: *Thinke not, O Emperour, that thou hast any right over divine things: for the Palace is for the Emperour, but Churches for Priests.* And that also of *Athanasius*, *It's neither lawfull for us to hold a Kingdome upon earth: nor hast thou O Emperour power over sacred things.* Wee see they speake of their Ministery and Ecclesiasticall vocation as of a sovereigntie, and rule, and that more sacred, then that of Princes, of which Princes were not worthy, or capable. And to passe by the blinde times of Popery wherein upon these grounds the *Roman* Bishops inthralled a great part of Christendome with temporall bondage, wee shall finde also that since the abjuration of *Romish* servitude, yet Protestant Ministers themselves have assumed a sanctitie more then is due. The Kings Supremacie or Headship over the Ecclesiasticall or Spirituall State, Hee being accounted but meerly temporall in comparison of Priests is as ill wished by many Calvinists, as by Papists, their word is of Secular Princes, *Istis non competit iste Primatus.* And as Sir *Thomas More* suffered death in testimony of his dislike, so *Calvin* himselfe condemnes this Realme of Blasphemy for entitling *Henry* the Eighth Supreme Head of the Church here under Christ. And not

only the Name, but the power it ſelfe which wee give to Civill Magiſtrates he proteſteth againſt, as that which had wounded him deeply, Princes being made thereby too ſpirituall, hee complaineth that this fault did raigne throughout *Germany*, and in ſome parts of *France*, to the taking away of Spirituall Regiment, whilſt Princes were made chiefe Judges as well in matters of doctrine as diſcipline.

Hence it is that all which follow *Calvin*, which is almoſt the generality of Proteſtants, beſides Papiſts, hold Princes incompetent for ſpirituall Regencie, accounting the intermedling of Princes therein as an abolition, or prophanation of the ſame.

And hence it is, that our contrary faction of Hierarchiſts alſo, deny the Kings Supremacie in *Spiritualibus*, though not in *Eccleſiaſticis*, and our Prelats Style is *providentia divina*, not *gratiâ Regis*, and as they iſſue Writs in their own Names, ſo they uſe their owne armes in their Seales, and not the Kings. And wee know it was my Lord of *Canterburies* induſtry of late to procure a Commiſsion about five yeeres ſince, that all Biſhops Courts might proceed without any ſubordination or dependency to any other of the Kings Courts. So that though they complaine of the Presbyterian Diſcipline, and the doctrine of *Calvin* as injurious to Princes, yet they themſelves ſeeme to be of the ſame confederacie.

But that I may not ſeem to miſreport, or miſinterpret any, I will cite only two Divines of prime note, both defenders of Supremacie. *Hooker ſpeaking*

ing of that dutifull subjection which is due from all Christians to the Pastors of their souls in respect of their sacred Order, affirmes *that the same is as due from Kings and Princes, as from their meanest vassals.* Reverence due to the Word, and Sacraments, and to Gods Ordinances is not here meant, for that is as due from Priests themselves also, as from any other, it is meant of reverence due to the persons of Priests, & this he cals *subjection, and challenges as due in respect of their sacred Order.* And so *Bilson* descanting upon the words of *Nazianzen*, after a comparative manner (as *Hooker* did) inferres thereupon, *that Priests have a greater and perfecter regiment then Princes: For* (sayes he) *Priests governe the souls of men, and dispense the mysteries of God, whereas Princes are set to rule the bodies of men, and to dispose the things of this life, &c.* Hee does not compare the offices but the Regiments of Priests and Princes, and hee averres as confidently that Priests governe the souls, and exercise dominion over the spirits of Christians, as that Princes have no power at all, but over the bodies and temporalities of their Subjects. And for these causes the Crosier is generally preferred in Honour, and Sanctitie, before the Scepter: to detect therefore the errour of Divines herein, I will now truly produce, and throughly poize those arguments which they most rely upon. The first argument runs thus. *Spirituall things are not to be managed, and treated, but only by spirituall persons: but Princes are not spirituall, Ergo.* Wee must first understand here what is meant by spirituall things, and spirituall persons. If by spirituall things here, such things are meant as ap-

pertain to God and to Religion, and as concerne Gods ſervice in the Church, and the welfare of the ſouls and ſpirits of men; ſo all men have a ſpirituall charge in generall: for all men by their generall callings are ſervants to God, and are not only bound to provide for their owne ſouls, but to promote alſo the worſhip of God, and the ſalvation of other men. And in this reſpect that man which is moſt pious, is moſt holy, and ſpirituall, and moſt acceptable to God, and though his condition be but private here in this World, yet his reward in Heaven may be more glorious, then theirs who have publike Offices and Dignities here, and whoſe particular callings are farre more ſacred. But beſides this internall holineſſe of perſons viſible only to God, there is an externall, politicall holineſſe alſo of perſons which ariſes from our particular Functions in this World, and the meaſure of this holineſſe, is the profit and conſequence of our profeſſions, and employments. The Regall and Sacerdotall Offices have ever beene held comparatively of all other the moſt holy, and worſhipfull, and the reaſon is becauſe of all others they are the moſt advantagious, and of moſt extenſive benefit to the people of God. And therefore the perſon is alwayes valued according to the function, and the function according to its benefit, and not on the contrary: The man is Honourable becauſe hee is a King, and the King is honourable becauſe He is the Conſervator of the people: and of this reaſon of Honour man is able to Judge. God accepts of ſuch a man to ſerve him in ſuch an honourable place; the

the place is not here honourable, becauſe He ſerves in it, but he is Honourable becauſe the place is profitable: and though of Gods meere acceptance of the perſon no reaſon can be given, yet there is great reaſon that all men ſhould bee Honourable with men, as they are acceptable with God. God honoured the *Iſraelites* before other Nations; they were a royall Prieſthood in compariſon of Heathens, becauſe God by his peculiar choice of them to his ſervice did give them that more then regall, or more then Sacerdotall priviledge. The *Iſraelites* in condition were more contemptible, and in diſpoſition more incorrible than other Nations, but becauſe God ſeparates them they are holy, and becauſe God ſeparates them to ſerve him according to his pure will, they are holy as Princes, and Prieſts. Chriſtians alſo may now be termed Princes and Prieſts in compariſon of the *Iews* in as much as God of his free pleaſure is now more extenſive and diffuſive of his graces amongſt us, that we may adore him more ingenuouſly, more intelligently; and more comfortably then the *Jews* did: and in the like manner amongſt Chriſtians, Princes and Prieſts are yet higher elevated above common laymen, in as much as they have neerer acceſſe to God at the Throne and at the Altar, and by their more ſublime employments are more highly dignified, & more honorably conſecrated. With the Prince and the Prieſt no man will enter into any cõpetition, but the cõpetition now being between the Prince & the prieſt, we muſt ſearch into the nature of this political ſanctitie, that we may the better diſtinguiſh its degrees. *Cal-*

Calvin wee ſee complains, that the perſons of *Princes* are made too ſpirituall, by our appropriating to them ſpirituall authoritie: becauſe hee holds that authority too ſpirituall for their perſons. The ſame thing is here the reaſon of the ſame thing; ſpirituall offices and ſervices belong not to Princes, becauſe their perſons are not ſpirituall: and why are their perſons not ſpirituall? becauſe their offices, and ſervices are not ſpirituall. This is unjuſt and unſcholaſticall: againſt the perſon no exception lies, but ſuch as is drawn from the function; the perſon is coruſcant only by the rayes of the function: they which wil prove Kings to be not ſpiritual, muſt firſt prove their offices to be meerly temporall, and not on the contrary. Such proofs as infirme the Kings power, and intereſt in *ſpiritualibus* are proper, ſuch proofs let us heare. *Ambroſe*, and *Athanaſius* indeed ſay directly, that Emperours have no right over divine things, nor power over ſacred things: but they are very briefe, and give no reaſon for their allegations, nor doe they leave us ſatisfied in their true meanings. The perſons and offices of Kings were ever held ſacred, and if that which is ſacred be not ſpirituall, it were good that the difference were ſet forth between them. Palaces are for *Princes*, and Temples for *Prieſts*: but palaces are not the ſole intereſt of *Princes*, ſo as that they are excluded thereby from all power in Temples: nor is this a good reſult, becauſe prieſts may not move in the Civill Orbe, therefore *Princes* may not in the Eccleſiaſticall. But *Nazianzen* is more full, and expreſſive of his reaſons, and thoſe reaſons alſo are further preſſed by Biſhop *Bilſon*, let us bend

bend our forces thither. *Nazianzen* concludes *the regiment of Priests to be more perfect, and excellent then that of Princes,* and compares it to that of the soule over the body, because things committed to the priests charge are heavenly and spirituall, whereas Kings (he sayes) *have in their power things earthly, and bodily.* He takes three things here for granted, First, *that the office of a Priest is as properly and truly a power, and rule, as that of Princes.* Secondly, *that the rule of Princes extends only to earthly things.* Thirdly, *whatsoever may be spoken of the whole order of Priesthood, that he applyes to every particular Priest.* And thus hee seems to attribute a greater sanctitie not only *intensive*, but *extensive* also, to any priest, then to any Prince. The glosse of *Bilson* also hereupon is: *That Priests governe the souls of men, and dispense the mysteries of God, whereas Princes are set to rule the bodies of their Subjects, and to dispose the things of this life. And therefore if the fruits and effects of their callings be compared, the Preachers* (he sayes) *passes that of Princes by many degrees of excellence and perfection: God giving earthly food, and peace by the Prince, but heavenly grace and life by the Word and Sacraments; which wee receive from the mouthes, and hands of his Messengers. As to externall power, and corporall compulsion: So Preachers are servants to their brethren, Princes are Lords over them. Preachers may reprove & threaten, but Princes must seize the goods, and chastise the bodies of offenders. Preaches may shut the gates of Heaven against non-repentants: Princes must root them from the face of the earth, and inflict the just vengeance of their sins in this world. And whereas the Princes and Preachers functions concurre in ghostly and*

heavenly things, that the Preacher declareth, and the Prince eſtabliſheth the word of truth: yet the Preachers ſervice in theſe caſes excelleth the Princes: for that the word in the Preachers mouth ingendreth faith and winneth the ſoule unto God to ſerve him with a willing minde, whereas the Sword in the Princes hand ſtriketh only a terrour into men to reſtraine the outward act, but reformeth not the ſecrets of the heart. This is *Bilſon's* ſenſe, and I thinke the ſenſe of almoſt all our Divines: by this is *Nazianzen* fully ſeconded and abetted, for firſt, the true and proper rule of prieſts is not only aſſerted, but alſo explained, for it gives grace and life by the Word and Sacraments, it reproves and threatens, it ſhuts the gate of Heaven againſt Non-repentants. Secondly, the rule of princes is leſned, and that by this inſtance: for that the preacher winneth ſoules to a willing ſervice, but the prince by externall terrour reſtraineth only from the outward act of ſin. And thirdly, his compariſon is indefinite, betweene Prince, and preacher, that which is implyed of Prieſt in generall, hee ſeemeth to apply to every prieſt in particular. I muſt frame my anſwer to every particular. Power and Dominion of it ſelfe is divine, and adde but infinite, or abſolute to it, it is Divinitie it ſelfe. Nothing is more deſirable to man, or more adequate to the aymes of intelligent creatures then power; the Angels in Heaven are known to us by the Names of Thrones, and Principalities, Heaven it ſelf is knowne to us by the name of a Kingdome: and our beſt devotion to God conſiſts in aſcribing to him, honour, worſhip, ſubjection, &c. and the firſt and greateſt ſin of men and Angels, was

an

an aſpiring to undue Power, and excellence, Abſolute perfection and bleſſedneſſe is the Unitie of the Godhead, and that Unitie muſt needs ſubſiſt in abſolute power, abſolute wiſdome, and abſolute goodneſſe. Abſolute power alſo in order of Nature (according to mans underſtanding) as a Father gives being to abſolute wiſdome: as both give being to abſolute Goodneſſe. Whatſoever is in God muſt needs be God, and of the ſame ſubſtance indiviſible, and ſo infinite wiſdome, and infinite Goodneſſe, muſt needs be coeternall, and conſubſtantiall with infinite power: yet this excludes not all order of diſtinction; and according to order of diſtinction it is more proportionable to our capacitie, that infinite Wiſdome ſhould derive its divine generation from infinite power, then infinite power from infinite Wiſdome. Unitie of perfect bleſſedneſſe cannot comprehend any thing more then this Trinity, neither can it comprehend any thing leſſe: and therfore though this word Trinity cannot have any relation to the eſſence of God, or to his works *ad extra*, which flow from the eſſence, yet to his perſons it may, and to his internall operations, wherein one perſon is more generative then another. And according to theſe internal operations of the Deitie we ought (to ſpeak after the manner of men) to aſcribe prioritie of Order to infinite power, the firſt perſon of the Godhead, in as much as wee cannot conceive but that God is rather wiſe, as he is powerfull, and Good as hee is both powerfull, and wiſe: then that hee is powerfull, as hee is wiſe, or wiſe, and powerfull, as he is good. Having premiſed theſe things in generall concerning power, and

dominion, and the excellence thereof, I am come now to ſee what that power and Dominion is which Churchmen clayme to themſelves. Our Hierarchiſts uſe the words *Power* and *regiment* to deſcribe all their actions, and employments: the *Power of Order*, the *Power of Juriſdiction*, the *Power of the Word and Sacraments*, and the *Power of the Keys*, all their *ſpirituall Offices*, and *Faculties* are expreſſed in commanding, and high terms, that they may ſeem to owe no ſubordination, or dependence to any above themſelves. And this art they further uſe, when they would prove the excellence of their ſpirituall rule, they derive it from preaching, and the ſubordinate Offices of the Miniſtery, but when they would exerciſe their rule, then they alleage that to rule over Preachers is more, & greater then to preach: becauſe the ſpirits of men are properly ſubject to no rule; and becauſe preaching, though it be one of Gods moſt effectuall Ordinances, yet is no proper rule but a ſervice rather: therefore they lay hold of Eccleſiaſticall juridiction for proofe of their holy ſpirituall rule. And yet becauſe Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is of it ſelfe no ſuch divine ſublime thing, as the miniſtration of the Word, and Sacraments, nor ſo incompetent for Princes, as to the uſe of it, therefore their proofs are chiefly grounded upon the ordinances of the Word and Sacraments: but this ſlight impoſture cannot ſo delude us: for either Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is more ſacred and ſpirituall then the miniſtration of the Word, and Sacraments, or not; if it be, then theſe arguments drawne from the Word and Sacraments are impertinent: The

que-

queſtion is whether Princes be capable of ſuch juriſdiction or not, and this proves not the incapacity of Princes, this only proves the honour of ſuch capacitie: but on the other ſide, if it be not, yet there is the ſame impertinence, for if prieſts challenge to themſelves power in things more excellent, and holy, this excludes not Princes from things leſſe excellent, and holy: but wee ſhall not need to ſtick here.

The papiſts themſelves doe acknowledge, that to preach, &c. is leſſe then to rule, and to preſcribe Laws to preachers, &c. and *Bilſon* makes a plaine confeſſion, that the Sacerdotall Office is rather Miniſteriall, then Imperiall, and that ſuch reverence and ſubjection as is due in ſpirituall affaires from Princes is not due to the perſons of prieſts, but to the Ordinances of God, and to the graces of the Church: *For* (ſays hee) *the word is to be ſubmitted to in the mouths of Prophets, and the Ordinances are to be honoured in the adminiſtration of Prieſts, but the perſons of Prophets, and Prieſts, muſt not be objects to terminate this ſubmiſſion, and honour. God is to be honoured in the ſervice of his Miniſters, not the Miniſters in Gods ſtead: for in theſe ſervices there is the ſame honour due to GOD from Miniſters themſelves, as from Lay-men.* And therefore wee ſee if the greater Prieſt heare the word, &c. from the leſſe, this does not ſanctifie the leſſe above the greater, as it would, if ſanctitie did reſt in the perſon, and not in the Ordinance, or if it did not paſſe from the actor, or inſtrument, to the Author and Ordainer himſelfe. I thinke wee may therefore proceed now from this, that power, and

Government is a thing in it ſelfe moſt awfull and honourable, to this: that the trueſt owners thereof next under God, whom the Church ever look't upon as Gods immediate Vicegerents, and Deputies thereof, are Princes. Saint *Peter* 1.2. writing to the Church in the time of a Heathen, and impious Emperour, commands every ſoul to be ſubject to the higher powers. He acknowledges power in a very *Nero*, and that to be the higher power, and to that higher power of that *Nero* he ſubjects every ſoule Chriſtian and Heathen, Prieſt and Laymen. For the ſame cauſe alſo the primitives in *Tertullians* mouth make this humble profeſſion: *Colimus imperatorem, ut hominem à Deo ſecundum, & ſolo Deo minorem*: & this profeſſion was made under the Reign of wicked Emperours, to whom in Eccleſiaſticall affaires more might be denied, then to ours: for though *Reges, in quantum Reges ſerviunt Deo*, as Saint *Auguſtine* ſayes, yet *in quantum pii Reges*, they ſerve God the more glorioufly, and have a neerer acceſſe to God, and in that reſpect it may bee more truly ſaid of them, that they are *à Deo ſecundi, & ſolo Deo minores*: and if ſo, how awfull and venerable muſt this render their perſons, and with what ſubmiſſion muſt we proſtrate our ſelves at their ſacred feet? and that it may not ſeeme ſtrange that meer power and rule in an unbelieving or wicked Prince ſhould be ſo ſacred and inviolable, wee muſt take notice that the wickedneſſe of Princes in ill commands though it diſcharge us as to thoſe ill commands, yet it does not diſcharge their power or rule either in thoſe, or in any other: For when Princes rule well,

they

they are to be obeyed, when ill, they are to be endured, and this very indurance is an effect of obedience and ſubjection. *Peter* as a Citizen of the Common-wealth is a ſervant to *Nero*, and though in the meere conſideration of a Chriſtian, Hee has not dependance upon *Nero* further then is to be teſtified by ſuffering under him in ill commands, yet in all civill things, and things indifferent, his dependance remayns undiſſolved. If *Nero* forbid *Peter* to preach, contradicting God herein, whoſe power is ſtill tranſcendent, this prohibition binds not *Peter*, but if *Nero* uſe the Sword hereupon againſt *Peter*, this ſword is irreſiſtible, becauſe though in this it be injurious, in other things it is ſtill ſacred. This one violence of *Nero* is tyrannous, but the authority whereby this is done is not tyranny; For the ſame ſword which offends one defends many ſtill, and if one here be defended, many muſt be offended, and the good of many is to be preferred before the good of one. And yet if God had made *Peter* ſupreame Judge of ſuch caſes, and had given him a power independent, it had been neceſſary that he had given him withall ſome remedie, and ſufficient means to ſupport the ſame Supremacy & independent right: for God gives no man an abſolute right without ſome proper remedy appertaining to the ſame. The uſe of power is not to intreat, or perſwade only, for theſe may bee done without power, but to command, and commands are vaine without compulſion, and they which may not compell, may not command, and they which cannot command, may not meddle at all except to intreat,

or

or perſwade. Power then there muſt be , and that power muſt be ſomewhere ſupreame that it may command all good, and puniſh all evill, or elſe it is inſufficient , and if all , then in religious as well as in civill caſes, for Supremacie may be ſeverally exerciſed, but the right of it cannot be ſeverally enjoyed : if *Peter* may doe more then perſwade *Nero*, the Scepter is *Peters* not *Neroes*; if hee may doe no more, he is as meer a ſubject as any other Layman : but in whetherſoever the power of commanding reſts, it cannot reſt in both, the Scepter cannot be ſhared, independence cannot be divided : the people cannot obey both as equall Judges whilſt their judgments remain contrary, nor ſerve both as equal Lords whilſt their commands are contrary. To perſwade and intreat in Miniſters , are the offices of a bleſſed vocation, but they are not properly Enſigns of Royaltie, and power: and if the ſpirits of men are ſomtimes moved, & won by the perſwaſions of Miniſters , as they may by other means , yet captivated , and commanded they cannot be : and therefore if this be called power, it is but imaginary, and improper, and ſuch as ought not to enter into any compariſon , or rivalitie with that ſolid, ſenſible, coercive, binding power wherewith God has inveſted his true Lievtenants upon earth. That power which is proper , muſt include not only a right of commanding , but alſo an effectuall vertue of forcing obedience to its commands, and of ſubjecting and reducing ſuch , as ſhall not render themſelves obedient. The ſupreame civill Magiſtrate has this power grounded upon the common conſent of Mankinde , and as ſtrong as is the politicall conſent

ſent of humane nature in its ſupream Law of publike conſervation, ſo vigorous, and invincible is this power. Had Prieſts any ſuch power or ſword, we ſhould ſoon ſee it, and feele it, and voluntarily ſtoop under it: but ſince they can pretend to none ſuch, the meere noyſe of an imaginary ſpirituall power and ſword muſt not deceive us. The ſword muſt be of ſympathy and proportion anſwerable to thoſe commands for which it was ordained, if the commands be externall and politicall, the ſword muſt not be inviſible, and meerly ſpirituall. If the *Pope* can impoſe an oath upō us to ſtand to his laws, and to obey his awards, our obedience being here politicall, his power of impoſing Oaths muſt be the like; for if he pretend a right, and have no remedy, that is no power; & if he have a remedy that is not of the ſame nature with his command, it will prove no remedy, it will be found vain and uneffectuall. Wee cannot thinke that God has given the Pope any power but for good, and wee cannot think that power good, whereby the Pope may deſtroy Millions of ſouls, and yet cannōt reclayme, or convince one. The Popes commands ſeeme to mee unreaſonable, unnaturall, impious, the Pope herein ha's no ſpirituall power to rectifie mee, or to diſcover my errour to me, or to procure obedience from me, that power which he ha's over my ſoule is only to exclude it from heaven, and to give it as a prey to Satan, for not attributing more to him then to my own conſcience, and naturall light. Can wee think that God gave this new Power, never before knowne, to theſe latter days out of mercy, that all

except one handfull of men ſhould periſh by it, and none at all receive benefit by it? It cannot be ſaid that the ſame keys which ſhut heaven to ſo many, open heaven to any one: for thoſe few which obey the Pope, obey him either voluntarily, or by conſtraint: and they which are conſtrained, obey him as a Prince, not as a Prieſt, and bow under his temporall, not ſpirituall yoke: howſoever it be otherwiſe pretended. Voluntary obedience alſo is ſuch as is rendred without any externall influence from the Pope; For the will is capable of no compulſion, and if it were, my will would be as lyable to the ſame as any other mans: and if the Pope may compell my will, and ſo open Heaven to me (as it were) by his ſpirituall keys, and will not, tis his crueltie, not my contumacie. Its no glory to the Pope, that ſome few by blinde voluntary obedience acknowledge the power of his keyes, in this hee has no advantage of *Mahomet*, that ſword which was ſo victorious in the hand of *Mahomet*, was as ſpirituall, and as univerſally prevalent as the Popes. So much of the imaginary rule and ſpiritual ſword of Prieſts, as alſo of the reall effectuall dominion of Princes, I ſhall now prove further, that the ſword of Kings if it be not ſo ſpirituall, as the Pope pretends, to cut off ſouls; yet it is more then temporall, and extends to things moſt ſpirituall. The Founders and Patriarchs of the World before the Law of *Moſes*, did not only governe the Church, but alſo execute all paſtorall, ſpirituall Offices as they were Princes, and Supream Potentates within their own limits: they did not governe men as they were the Prieſts

Priests of God, but they did sacrifice and officiate before God, as they were the Heads, and Governours of men. In those times it was not held usurpation, or intrusion upon priests, for Princes to sacrifice with their own hands, or to teach the will of God with their own mouthes; it would have been held presumption if any else had attempted the like, and a dishonour to Gods service. Nature then taught that the most excellent person was most fit for Gods service in the Church, and that no person could be more excellent, then hee which served God in the Throne. The word priest now may have divers acceptions. In some sense whole Nations have been called priests, *viz.* comparatively, and in some sense all Fathers of Children, and Masters of Servants are in the nature of priests, and in more usuall sense all Princes, so farre as they have charge and cure of souls, and are intrusted with Divine Service within their severall commands, are more supereminently taken for priests: but the most usuall sense is this. A priest is hee which hath cure of Souls, and a trust of Gods worship by a more peculiar kinde of publike and politike consecration and dedication thereunto: of such consecration, or ordination, before *Aaron*, we read nothing, and for ought I see, we are bound to believe nothing. *Melchisideck* was a pious man, a devout Father, a religious Master, nay, a zealous Prince and Commander, but in all these respects hee had no priviledge nor right to the denomination of priest more then *Adam*, *Sem*, *Noah*, &c. had. You will say then how is that denomination given him so peculiarly? This

denomination might be given not by reaſon of any externall, formall, ceremoniall Unction, or impoſition of hands, or any other ſolemne Dedication or ſeparation before men: but in this reſpect, that he did perhaps publikely officiate in the preſence of all his Subjects, and perhaps in behalfe of all his ſubjects, and this is a higher and bleſſeder Sacerdotall Office, then any we read of in his predeceſſors or ſucceſſors till *Aarons* dayes. It is probable that God was ſerved in Families before *Aaron*, and perhaps there were ſolemne days and Feaſts, which all Families by joynt conſent did in ſeverall places dedicate to Gods ſervice by ſtrict obſervance of the ſame, but that any publike places were appointed for whole Congregations to joyne and meet publikely in under the charge and function of any one publike Prieſt, till *Aaron* is not ſpecified. This only we may gueſſe by the ſpeciall name of prieſt applied to *Melchiſedeck*, that perhaps being a prieſt of *Salem*, he was the firſt that made the worſhip of God ſo publike: and did not only by the generall influence of his power take order for the ſervice and knowledge of God in ſeverall Families, but alſo gather ſeverall aſſemblies of united Families, and there publikely ſacrifiſe and officiate in behalf of great, and ſolemne Congregations: wherein he might far exceed *Abraham*. Howſoever its ſufficient for my purpoſe, that this he might doe by vertue of his Regall power and dignity without any further conſecration or Sacerdotal inſtalment whatſoever. And in this reſpect he was without predeceſſor, and perhaps ſucceſſor, ſo that I think hee was the moſt lively

lively and Honourable type of our Saviour: for *Aarons* Order was Subſtitute, and his conſecration was performed by the hand of his Prince and Superiour, and being ſo conſecrated, He did ſacrifiſe, not as a Prince but meerly as a Prieſt. Whereas *Melchiſedeck* received his Order from none but himſelfe, and ſo remayned not only independent, but his ſervice alſo being both Regall and Sacerdotall, as our Saviours alſo was, it was yet more Honorable in that it was Regall, then in that it was Sacerdotall. And this certainly ſutes beſt with our Saviours Order, for no Secular authority but his own did concurre in his inauguration, hee was his owne Anceſtor in this, in that his owne Royall dignitie gave vertue to his Sacerdotall: and though hee would not aſſume to himſelfe the externall Function of Royalty in meer Secular things, yet in this he would follow holy *Melchiſedeck*. But to paſſe from *Melchiſedeck*, within ſome few ages after wee finde the Scepter and Cenſor ſevered; Wee finde no prints of great Empires before *Moſes*, for in ſmall Countries we finde divers petty independant principalities: and it may be imagin'd that neither true policie, nor wicked tyranny was then knowne in ſuch perfection, as now it is. The *Iſraelites* at their departure from *Egypt* were a great and formidable Nation, as appeares by the combinations of many other Potentates againſt them, yet at that time the weightie charges both of prince and prieſt were ſupported by *Moſes* alone. This was exceeding grievous till *Jethro* in civill affaires, and till God himſelfe in matters of Religion, for his further eaſe,

took much of his laborious part from off his ſhoulders; Subordinate Magiſtrates were now appointed in the State, and prieſts and Levits in the Church, the Nation being growne numerous, and Ceremonies in Religion very various: but wee muſt not think that *Moſes* was hereby emptied, or leſned of any of his Civill, or Eccleſiaſticall authoritie: as he retained ſtill Supremacie of power to himſelfe in all things, ſo that Supremacy became now the more awfull, and Majeſticall. The poet ſays of waters,

Maxima per multos tenuantur flumina rivos.

And indeed did waters run backwards they would ſpend and diminiſh themſelves by often diviſions in their courſes: but we ſee that in their ordinary naturall Tracts many litle petty ſtreams officiouſly haſten to diſcharge themſelves into greater, ſo that the more continued the courſe is, the greater the ſtreams ever grow. It is ſo with power both in Church and State: Sovereigntie is as the mayne Ocean, of its vaſt abundance it feeds all, and is fed by all, as it is the fountain to enrich others, ſo it is the Ciſterne to receive and require back againe all the riches of others. That which *Moſes* parted with all and derived to others was for the better expedition both of pietie and juſtice, that GOD might be more duly ſerved, that the people might be more quickly relieved, and that his own ſhoulders might be the freelier disburdened: for as a man hee could not intend univerſall buſineſſe: yet a Prince he might well ſuperintend it in others. And it is manifeſt that after the ſeparation of the Prieſthood,

hood, he did ſtill as ſuperiour to *Aaron* in the moſt ſacred things approach God in the Mountain to receive the cuſtodie of the Law from Gods hand, and to receive Orders from God for the Tabernacle, and all religious ſervices, and did performe the act of conſecration to Prieſts, and did always conſult with God by Prieſts, and command all men as well Prieſts, and Levits, as other men. *Hooker* and *Bilſon*, and I thinke moſt of our Divines doe confeſſe not only this, that *Moſes* retained all Eccleſiaſticall Supremacie to himſelfe, but that hee left the ſame alſo to his Succeſſours. *Hooker* ſayes that by the ſame ſupreame power *David*, *Aſa*, *Jehoſaphat*, *Joſias*, &c. made thoſe Lawes and Statutes (mentioned in ſacred Hiſtory) touching matters of meer Religion, the affairs of the Temple, and ſervice of God. And by vertue of this power the piety and impietie of the King did alwayes change the publike face of Religion, which the Prophets by themſelves never did, nor could hinder from being done. And yet if Prieſts alone had bin poſſeſt of all ſpirituall power, no alteration in Religion could have beene made without them, it had not beene in the King, but in Prieſts to change the face of Religion. And the making of Eccleſiaſticall Lawes alſo with other like actions pertayning to the power of dominion had ſtill been recorded for the acts of Prieſts, and not of Kings: whereas we now find the contrary. *Hooker* ſays this and more, and *Bilſon* ſayes not one jot leſſe. Hee confeſſes the *Jewiſh* Kings were charged with matters of Religion,

ligion, and the cuſtodie of both Tables, nay, publiſhing, preſerving, executing points of Law concerning the firſt table hee aſſignes as the principall charge committed to Kings, as Kings, Religion being the foundation of policy. Hee inſtances alſo in the good Kings of *Iudah*, who as they were bound, ſo they were commended for their dutie by God himſelfe, in removing Idols, purging abominations, reforming Prieſts, renewing the covenant, and compelling all Prieſts, Prophets, people, to ſerve God ſincerely. Many of the learnedeſt papiſts doe not gainſay this evident truth, and therefore *Stapleton* being I ſuppoſe fully convinced of it, ſeekes to anſwer and avoid it another way.

But I proceed to the times of thraldome, wherein the *Iews* were governed by the *Perſians*. How far the *Iews* were left in *Babylon* to the free exerciſe of their own Religion is uncertain, it may be conceived that their condition was not alwayes alike under all Kings, but generally that they found more favour there, then Chriſtians did afterwards under the *Roman* Emperours: before this time there is no probability of Excommunication, or any ſpirituall Judicature, wee reade nothing of *Maranathaes*, or *Anathemaes*, but now perhaps ſome ſuch government might take place: for where no peculiar conſecrated Miniſtery is, the Magiſtrate is fitteſt to officiate before God, and where no Magiſtracie is permitted Miniſters are fitteſt to preſerve order. Some Papiſts that wil undertake to prove any thing out of any thing alleage *Cain* as an inſtance of Excom. as if

Adam

Adam were so a Priest, as that hee were no Prince, and had power to excommunicate in case of so horrid a murder, but not to execute any other Law: or as if *Moses* would proceed against adultery by temporall punishment, when *Adam* had proceeded against murther by spiritual: but not to insist longer upon these conjecturall passages, I come to our Saviours days, & his government also being Regal, as wel as Sacerdotall, nay, being rather divine then either, I shal not stay there neither. Our mayn strife is how the Apostles & their successors governed after his Ascention during the times of persecution: but little need to be said hereof: For in Scripture wee finde the Apostles themselves very humble, and unlordly, and transacting all things (according to our Saviours command and example) rather by perswasion, and evidence of the spirit, then by command and constraint, and if any difference was between a Bishop and a Priest, it was in outward eminence or majoritie very small: and the very termes themselves were promiscuously applyed. In the next ensuing times also wee finde by ancient Testimony, that *Omnia communi Clericorum consilio agebantur*: and after that Episcopacy had gotten some footing, yet, as another ancient testimony informes us, *exceptâ Ordinatione*, setting Ordination only aside it challenged no priviledge above Presbyters: but as I have said before, whatsoever authority did reside in the Clergie whilst temporal rule was wanting to the Church, and whilst miraculous power of binding and loosing sinners, and of opening and shutting Heaven was supplyed by the Holy Ghost

for the emergent neceſſity of thoſe times, the reaſon thereof no longer remayning, it ought now to remayne no longer as it did, but to devolve againe into the Tempor ll Rulers hands; from whence it was not taken by Chriſt, but where it was then abuſed, and made unprofitable by the owners themſelves. If wee doe imagine that *Timothy* and *Titus* had Epiſcopall power, and by that Epiſcopall power did ſend out proceſſes, and keep Courts, and holds pleas of all Teſtamentary, and Matrimoniall Cauſes, and Tithes, Faſts and all other which our Biſhops now clayme; and did redreſſe all grievances for the preventing of confuſion in the Church, during the malignity of Secular power; if wee take all this for granted, though it be ſome thing too large to be granted, yet ſtill wee ought to conceive that this power was conferred upon them not in derogation of Secular authoritie, but for neceſſities ſake, till Secular authority ſhould againe come in, and undertake the ſame offices, which *Timothy* and *Titus* were now to performe: when confuſion cannot otherwiſe bee prevented, *Timothy* and *Titus* ſhall governe, but when it may be prevented by that authoritie which is moſt competent, and when more perfect order ſhall bee more naturally and juſtly induced, what injury is this to *Timothy* or *Titus*? Why rather is it not an eaſe and comfort to them, that they have now leaſure more ſeriouſly to attend their own proper function, and miniſtration? *Hookers* owne words are, *if from the approbation of Heaven the Kings of GODS own choſen people had in the affaires of the Jewiſh Religion*

ſu-

supreame power, why should not Christian Kings have the like in Christian Religion? And *Bilson* having maintained the supremacie of the Jewish Kings, *Hee ascribes the like to the whole function.* Hee sayes, *it is the essentiall charge of Princes to see the Law of God fully executed, his Son rightly served, his Spouse safely nursed, his house timely filled, his enemies duly punished*, and this he sayes, *as it was by* Moses *prescribed*, *and by* David *required, so it was by* Esay *propheſied, by Christ commanded, by* Paul *witneſſed*, *and by the Primitive Fathers consented too.* Hee sayes further, *that what the Jewish Kings had, Christian Kings ought to enjoy, and therefore Esay* (sayes Hee) *propheſying of the Evangelicall times, foretold that the Church should suck the breasts of Kings and Queens, and that milk which those breasts should afford*, He interprets *to be spirituall milk.* Now what can be added to this, what more excellent and perfect Regiment then this had *Timothy* and *Titus* committed to them by vertue of their Episcopall Order? What more sacred, what more spirituall offices could they performe in the Church? What could Gods children suck from their brests other then milke, then sincere, spirituall milke? Saint *Augustine* agrees to this, when hee sayes *that Kings, as Kings, serve God, so as none but Kings can doe*, and when he confesses, *that Christ came not to the detriment of sovereigntie.* And the Church in *Tertullians* words, *ascribing worship to their Heathen Emperours, as being second immediatly to God, and inferiour to none but God*, sayes as much as words can expresse. In regard of internall sanctitie *Peter* may be more excel-

lent then *Cæsar*, and so may *Lazarus* perhaps then *Peter*: but in regard of that civill sanctitie which is visible to mans eye, *Cæsar* is to be worshipped more then *Peter*. *Cæsar* is to be looked upon as next in place here to God, betwixt whom and God no other can have any superiour place. Wisdome and goodnesse are blessed graces in the sight of GOD, but these are more private, and Power is an excellence more perfect, and publike, and visible to man then either: if Ministers do sometimes in wisdome, and goodnesse excell Princes, yet in Power they doe not: and therefore though wisdome and goodnesse may make them more amiable somtimes to God, yet Power shall make Princes more Honourable amongst men. There is in heaven no need of Power in the glorified creatures, and yet the glorified creatures are there differenced by Power: it is hard to say that one Angell, or Saint differs from another in wisdome, or in holinesse, yet that they differ in power and glory we all know. The twelve Patriarchs and the twelve Apostles sit in heaven upon higher Thrones, then many Saints which perhaps here in this life might be endued with a greater portion of wisdome, and holinesse then they were: and by this it may seeme that there is a species of externall sanctitie of power dispensed according to the free power of God even in Heaven also, and that that sanctity is superiour to the other more private sanctity of other graces, and excellences. And if power in heavenly creatures where it is of no necessity has such a supereminent glory ap-

appertaining to it, with what veneration ought wee to entertain it on earth where our common felicitie and safetie does so much depend upon it? Goodnesse here wee see is a narrow excellence, without wisdome, and power: and wisdome in men that have neither power, nor goodnesse, scarce profits at all: but power in infants, in women, in Ideots hands is of publike use, in as much as the wisdome and goodnesse of other men are ready to be commanded by it, and its more naturall that they should be obsequious and officious in serving power, then that the transcendent, incommunicable, indivisible Royalty of power, should condiscend to bee at their devotion. And for this reason when Princes are said to be *solo Deo minores*, and *Deo secundi*, this is spoken in regard of power, and this being spoken in regard of power, we must conceive it spoken of the most perfect excellence, and dignity, and sanctitie that can be imagined amongst men on earth. And for the same reason, when Princes are said to serve God as Princes, and so to serve him as none other can, we must conceive this spoken also with respect to their power, in as much as wisdome and goodnesse in other men cannot promote the glory of God, and the common good of man, so much as power may in them.

But *Stapleton* takes foure exceptions to those times, whereby if it bee granted that the *Jewish* Kings had supreame Ecclesiasticall authority, yet hee sayes, *it does not follow that our Kings now ought to have the same.* Hee sayes, first, *That the Jewish Re-*

ligion was of farre leſſe dignitie and perfection then ours is: ours being that truth of which theirs was but a ſhadowiſh prefigurative reſemblance. Our anſwere here is, that the Religion of the Jews, *as to the eſſence of it, was not different from ours, either in dignitie or perfection. The ſame God was then worſhipped as a Creatour, Redeemer, Sanctifier, and that worſhip did conſiſt in the ſame kinde of love, feare, hope, and beliefe, and the ſame charitie, and juſtice amongſt men. The Law of Ceremonies, and externall Rites in the bodily worſhip of God, did differ from our diſcipline, that being more pompous and laborious: but the two great Commandements which were the effects, and contents of all heavenly, ſpirituall, indiſpenſible worſhip, and ſervice, whereby a love towards God above that of our ſelves, and a love towards man equall with that of our ſelves was enjoyned, theſe two great Commandements were then as forcible, and honourable, as they are now. Sacrifice was but as the garment of Religion, obedience was the life, the perfection, the dignity of Religion, and the life, perfection, and dignitie of that obedience conſiſted then in thoſe weighty matters of the Law, Piety, and mercie, as it now does; but if the* Jewiſh *Religion was leſſe excellent, and more clogged with ſhadows, and ceremonies in its outward habit, what argument is this for the Supremacie of Regall, rather then Sacerdotall power? The more abſtruſe and dark the forme of that worſhip was, and the more rigorous ſanctity God had ſtamped upon the places, and inſtruments, and formalities of his worſhip, and the more frequent, and intricate queſtions might ariſe thereabout, me thinks, the more uſe there was of Sacerdotall honour, and prerogative, and the leſſe of Regall in*

mat-

matters of the Lord: I see not why this should make Princes more spirituall then their Order would beare, but Priests rather. His second reason is. *That all parts of the* Jewish *Religion, Laws, Sacrifices, Rites, Ceremonies, being fully set down in writing, needing nothing but execution, their Kings might well have highest authoritie, to see that done: Whereas with us there are numbers of mysteries even in beliefe which were not so generally for them as for us necessary to be with some expresse acknowledgment understood, many things belonging to externall government, and our service not being set down by particular ordinances, or written, for which cause the State of the Church doth now require that the spirituall authoritie of Ecclesiasticall persons be large, absolute, and independent.* This reason is every way faulty: for as to matters of Discipline and externall worship our Church is lesse incumbred with multiplicity of Rites, such as Saint *Paul* cals carnall and beggerly rudiments, and in this respect there is the lesse use of Ecclesiasticall authoritie amongst us: and if popish Bishops doe purposely increase Ceremonies, that they may inlarge their own power, they ought not to take advantage of their own fraud. And as for matters of faith and doctrinall mysteries, we say according to Gods ancient promise knowledg doth now abound by an extraordinary effusion of Gods Spirit upon these latter dayes; wee are so farre from being more perplexed with shadows, and mysticall formalities, or with weighty disputes, that we are, and ought to be a great deal lesse, and we doe the rather suspect all popish traditions, and additions in Religion,

ligion, becauſe wee ſee they make uſe of them for the augmenting of the power and regiment of Prelates. And yet if knowledge did not abound, if our Religion were more cloudie, and if the Scriptures, Councils, Fathers, and all learning were now more imperfect to us then they are, I cānot imagin how an uncōfined abſolute dominion of Churchmen ſhold be more neceſſary thē of Princes. For if abſolutenes of power be of neceſſary uſe in intricate perplexed myſteries & cōtroverſies, yet why muſt that abſolute power be more effectuall in Prieſts then Princes? is not the counſel of Prelats the ſame, and of the ſame vigor to ſolve doubts, and determine controverſies, whether their power be ſubordinate, or not? doth meer power ad to the knowledg of Prieſts? or is the power of Prieſts more virtuous for the promoting of truth, then the power of Magiſtrates? how comes this vaſt irreconcilable difference betwixt the government of the Church and State? In matters of Law, in matters of policy, in matters of war, unlimited power in ſuch as are moſt knowing and expert does not conduce to the ſafety of the Common-wealth: ſubordinate Counſells are held as available for the diſcerning of truth, and far more available for the conſerving of peace and order. And who can then aſſigne any particular ſufficient reaſon, why matters of religion ſhould not as well be determined in the conſiſtory by dependent Prelates, as matters of Law are by the Judges and Juſtices in their tribunals, where they ſit as meere ſervants to the King?

His

His third exception is : *That God having armed the* Jewiſh *Religion with a temporall ſword, and the Chriſtian with that of ſpirituall puniſhment only , the one with power to impriſon , ſcourge, put to death , the other with bare authoritie to cenſure , and excommunicate , there is no reaſon why our Church which hath no viſible ſword ſhould in regiment be ſubject unto any other power then only to that which bindeth and looſeth.*

This reaſon taketh it for granted , that amongſt the Jewes the Church and State was the ſame , had the ſame body, the ſame head, the ſame ſword, and that head was temporall, and that ſword was materiall. This we freely accept of: but in the next place, without any reaſon at all given , it as freely aſſumes, that Chriſtians now have only a ſpirituall ſword in the Church , as that Jews had only a temporall one. A diametricall oppoſition is here put betwixt Jews and Chriſtians in Church Regiment , and yet no cauſe ſhewed , or account given of that oppoſition.

We have very good colour to argue , that without ſome ſtrong reaſon ſhewed of oppoſition, Chriſtians ought not to bee ſo contrary to that excellent diſcipline of the Jewes which God himſelf ordered, and to introduce I know not what ſpirituall rule in prejudice of temporall rule : but how will *Stapleton* prove, that amongſt Chriſtians the Church and

State are two divided bodies, ſo as they may admit of two ſeverall heads, and ſeverall ſwords, the one temporall the other ſpirituall, the one yielding precedence as temporall, the other predominating as ſpirituall? This wee deſire to ſee fortified with better proofs.

Hooker in his eighth booke not yet publiſht has a learned cleere diſcourſe to ſhew the fallacie, and injuſtice of this blind preſumption. *Hee allows that a Church is one way, and a Commonwealth another way defined, and that they are both in nature diſtinguiſht, but not in ſubſtance perpetually ſevered. Since there is no man* (ſayes hee) *of the* Church *of* England, *but the ſame is a member of the* Common-wealth, *nor any of the* Common-wealth, *but the ſame is of the* Church, *therefore as in a figure triangle, the baſe differs from the ſides, and yet one and the ſelf-ſame line, is both a baſe and a ſide: a ſide ſimply, a baſe if it chance to be the bottome, and to underlie the reſt. So though properties and actions of one doe cauſe the name of a* Common-wealth, *qualities and functions of an other ſort give the name of a* Church *to a multitude, yet one and the ſame multitude may be both. Thus in* England *there's none of one* Corporation, *but hee is of the other alſo, and ſo it was amongſt the Jews. Two things cauſe this errour.*

Firſt, becauſe profeſſours of the true Religion ſomtimes live in ſubjection under the falſe, ſo the Jews

Jews *did in* Babylon, *so the* Christians *in* Rome *under* Nero, *in such cases true professors doe civilly only communicate with the State; but in matters of their Religion they have a communion amongst themselves. This now is not our case, and therefore these instances are not proper amongst us.*

Secondly, *In all States there is a distinction between spirituall and temporall affaires and persons, but this proveth no perpetuall necessity of personall separation: for the Heathens always had their spirituall Laws and persons and causes severed from their temporall, yet this did not make two independent States among them: much lesse doth God by revealing true Religion to any Nation distract it thereby into severall independent communities, his end is only to institute severall functions of one and the same community.* Thus farre *Hooker* most judiciously, and profoundly.

Wee must not here expect any satisfaction from our Adversaries, why there should be lesse division betweene Church and State amongst the *Jews*, and lesse use of two severall swords, then is amongst us: 'tis sufficient that they have said it. There's no crime so scandalous amongst our Church-men, or wherein they claime so much spirituall interest of jurisdiction as adultery, yet amongst the *Iews* that crime was carnall, not spirituall; and its punishment was death inflicted by the Civill Judge, not damnation denounced by the Priest. Now if adultery in these days were

better purged away, and leſſe countenanced in our Chriſtian Courts then it was amongſt the Jews, there might ſomething be alleaged to preferre our moderne inventions before Gods owne Statutes, but when Eccleſiaſtiall perſons ſhall therefore incroach upon Civill, that by, I know not what, pecuniary corruptions and commutations, vice, and ſcandall may abound, we doe ſtrangly dote to ſuffer it.

For his laſt reaſon he ſays: *That albeit, whilſt the Church was reſtrained into one people, it ſeemed not incommodious to grant their Kings generall chiefty of power, yet now the Church having ſpread it ſelf over all Nations great inconvenience muſt thereby grow if every Chriſtian King in his ſeverall Territorie ſhould have the like power.*

By this reaſon its preſumed, that all the Univerſe ought to have but one head on earth, and that *Rome* muſt be its Court, and that it muſt be indued with Oraculous infallibilitie, and ſo to remayne till the Worlds end: and this muſt bee admitted out of ſome obſcure generall Metaphors in Scripture, or elſe God has not ſufficiently provided for the wiſe government of his Catholike Church. Man can ſcarce imagine any thing more miſchievous, or impoſſible, then that which theſe goodly Politicians have invented to be profitable, nay neceſſary for the univerſall government of Mankind: for what one man can receive Appeals either in temporall or ſpirituall affaires,

or

or direct finall, unerring dispatches to all the remote climates of the earth at one time? or what a cursed vexation were it for all people of all languages and customes to be chained to One City, thither to travell for all finall determinations, and there to attend confused sentences, and in the mean time to endure at home endlesse dissentions, and hopelesse divisions under the insufficient rule of subordinate limited Princes and Bishops? Surely had *Mahomet* preached any such grosse doctrine amongst his ragged, barbarous *Arabians*, hee had never tamed and broken them so easily to his wretched usurpation: Tis wonderfull that our Ancestors could drink of such a cup of intoxication in the worst of times, but that the nauseous dregs of its bottome should now be obtruded upon us in these golden, shining dayes, is almost past belief.

The Pope never yet had the rule of a third part of the World, but so far as hee ha's had it he ha's given sufficient testimony how insupportable great Monarchies are, both to the Governour, and the governed. And where the yoke of *Rome* ha's prevailed, what ha's that infallible judgement, and unlimitable power, which the Pope pretends to for our good, what ha's it availed the Church of God? when the Easterne Churches were in Unitie, this gave them occasion to depart, and revolt, but when the rent was, what vertue

had the Pope to reduce them to unitie? The like may bee asked concerning all Protestant Countries now falne from Romish obedience, nay of al Turks & Heathens not yet subdued to the triple crown; if Christ intended the Popes infallibilitie for the discovery of all errors and heresies, and his supremacie for the subjugation of al such as would maliciously persevere in discord errours and heresies, how comes this intention to be so defeated, and frustrated? if the Popes keyes be potent enough for both these purposes, why does he not force all men to come in within his sheepfold? and if not, why does he pretend so much? Would Christ put into one Bishops hand an universall Scepter, such as the World never before heard of, such as hee himselfe here on earth never exercised, and yet leave it contemptible to the greatest part of the World? if ignorance prevail and incredulity, let the key of knowledge assist us, and bring us into light; if stubbornes and perversnesse have hardned our hearts, let the key of power dissolve and bruize us: and if hee can doe neither of these, what vertue is there in the Roman Oracle, what benefit is there in that prophetick chaire? what privilege ha's *Peter* more then *Iohn*? Shall the Citie of *Rome* it selfe be upheld and secured from ever erring and falling away, and shall not *England*, shall not *Scotland*, shall not all Nations be the like? The power of the Pope is the same in all Coun-

Countries, if it faile in *England*, it may faile at *Rome*; if it faile not at *Rome*, it would not faile in *England*, but that the Pope is leſſe propitious. O why ſhould his mercy bee more narrow, then his vertue? O let him once againe graciouſly aſcend his reverent chaire, let him congregate generall Councils, and there poure out the treaſures of his inſpired breaſt, let him there give judgements as cleere, pure, irrefragable, and as obvious to humane apprehenſion as Scripture it ſelf, nay, if ſomething more ſufficient then Scripture be neceſſary for the compoſing of all our ſtrifes, let him give us Solutions in a phraſe more powerful then the Apoſtles ever uſed, and preſcribe rules more convincing then God himſelfe, or Chriſt in his incarnation ever preſcribed, and if Kings and Emperours ſtill make reſiſtance, let him put on his robes of Majeſty and terrour, let him paſſe over them as Serpents and Baſilisks, whilſt the ſtroke of his foot upon the earth fils all Countries with battalions of armed men: nay if terreſtriall forces come not in faſt enough, let him ſhake the Heavens with the thunder of his voice, and call downe Seraphims to his attendance, and let the higheſt orders of Heaven give teſtimony to his earthly Deity. I might frame the like expoſtulations after a ſort againſt our own Prelats alſo, but I forbeare: for if God ha's given them ſole knowledge

to

to determine all controverſies, and power to enact all Eccleſiaſticall Canons, doubtleſſe hee ha's given them ſome binding coercive force correſpondent thereunto: and if ſo, why doe they not expel all diſſention by it? if their vertue extend no further then to exhortation, why do they urge commands upon us? if they have a commanding power, why do they not ſecond it with due compulſion?

And as this is ſufficient to prove independent power due to Chriſtian Princes in all cauſes whatſoever, ſo Hiſtorie makes it as plaine that Chriſtian Princes at their firſt entrance, till Popery beganne to intoxicate them, did clayme, and exerciſe the ſame as their due. *Conſtantine* had ἐπίσκοπος ἐπισκόπων given him for his Title, and wee know hee ſhewed himſelfe no leſſe, and wee know his Succeſſours for divers Ages did aſſume and verifie the ſame Title as their due. And therefore *Bilſon* proves out of *Socrates*, and other Hiſtorians, *That in the Primitive Chriſtian Emperours times all Eccleſiaſticall affairs did depend upon Emperours: and that the greateſt Synods, and Councels were called at their appointment: and that Appeals from Councels were reſerved to them, and ſometimes over-ruled by them: and that all Eccleſiaſticall Laws were by them enacted, confirmed, and repealed; and that the greateſt Prelates were by them ordered, and commanded: and that whole Provinces and Kingdomes were by them viſited, and reformed in all caſes whatſoever.*

And

And this truth, the learnedſt of Papiſts will nor deny, and thoſe wᵗʰ do deny the ſame rely upon ſome particular exception onely, and have very few inſtances before the Popes inthronization at *Rome*, and theſe of matters of fact, and not rights alledged neither. *Valentinian* the Elder is one maine Inſtance, and he when ſtrife was betweene the *Arians* and the Orthodox Chriſtians would not take upon him to determine the ſame, his modeſt Anſwer was, *non eſt meum judicare inter Epiſcopos*, And *Ambroſe* ſayes of him; *Inhabilem ſe ponderi tanti putabat eſſe Iudicii. Valentinian* here was a pious Emperor and Orthodox, but his blame was (as *Socrates* juſtly taxes him) that though he honoured thoſe that were of his true faith, and ſound opinion, yet he in the meane time let the *Arians* doe what they liſt. And this cannot be excuſed, for if hee was doubtfull of his owne faith, this was ignorance: and if Hee was not, and yet tolerated *Arianiſme*, this was neglect in him: and if he did ſhunne this deciſion as burthenſome to him, this was impious: and if as intricate, this was inconſiderate. For what if hee could not judge as a Biſhop, could not he therefore judge by Biſhops; was not the learning and knowledge of all Biſhops, at his command to be imployed, as if it were his owne? Biſhops themſelves might erre, and diſſent, and in that point many of them did erre, and hold againſt the truth: and without his ayde this diviſion was irreconcileable; but by his influence and ſuperintendence; truth might obtaine a faire tryall, and Biſhops themſelves might be convinced by Biſhops. This caſe in Divinity might be too intricate for his ſole judgment, and too pondrous for his actuall determination: but what he could not doe ſingle, and perſonally, Hee might well effect by the counſell and advice of his moſt moderate, and diſintereſſed Clergie: for in Divinity the Prince is as in juridicall, or Martiall affaires, As he is not alwayes the ableſt Divine, ſo neither is he the ableſt Lawyer, nor the ableſt Souldier, and yet by the advice of Divines, Lawyers, and Souldiers,

He may conclude that wisely which neither He without them nor they without him could ever have concluded. Therefore against this remisse, cold slackness, and hæsitancy of *Valentinian* we may oppose the politike, and courageous resolution of *Constantine*, *Theodosius* and diverse other pious Emperors, who all did compose debates, and end controversies, and vindicate Truth and Religion from many errors and abuses, wch otherwise had bin endlesse, and remedilesse. After the first 5. or 6. hundred yeares *Episcopacy* began to invade the rights of Royalty by the Sophistications, and impostures of the See of *Rome*, and till this last Age, Princes almost every where did blindly and superstitiously too farre abandon their owne right, but by the light of Nature, the wisest Kings in all Countryes were ever the most refractory, and most impatient of the Popes tyranny: and in the most ignorant times, some there were found, that made resistance to the same.

Much blood was shed upon this Theme in diverse other Countries, and even in our own stories we find, that though *England* was prone otherwise to be the Popes Asse, yet in the quarrell of supremacy it was jealous, and had almost perpetuall conflicts. I will only cite one story. *Henry* the second was a very puissant Prince, and in all other things except only Ecclesiasticall. He was fortunate and victorious: but his misery was, that He raigned in such an Age as the Pope was in his Zenith, and had to doe with *Becket* of all the Popes dependents the most seditious. *Henry* the first his Grandfather out of the greatnesse of his Spirit and wit, had passed these Lawes; That no Appeal should stand, That no Bishops should go out of the Realme, That no Tenant *in Capite* should bee excommunicated; That no officiall of the Kings should be interdicted without the Kings leave, and consent, And that Clergimen should be subject to secular judgement, and that Lay-men under the King, should judge of Tythes, and other causes Ecclesiasticall.

At these just and necessary Lawes, the Clergie hitherto rested quiet, if not contented, but now a most rebellious

Becket

Becket ariſes to ſpurne againſt them, and in his mouth they are dangerous incroachments, and breaches upon the Church. Rather than hee will ſubſcribe to theſe ſo long eſtabliſht Lawes; He departs the Kingdome in contempt of the King, and with all violence and bitterneſſe that may bee incenſes the Pope, the King of *France*, and all the *Italian* and *French* Biſhops againſt his naturall Lord. The King at firſt gallantly relyes upon the edge of his temporall ſword, and whets it ſharper in behalfe of his legall prerogative: and for ſome yeares together ſtands out againſt the danger of the Popes confounding blow; but at laſt when *Becket* the fierce Traytor was ſlaine, through the execrations and anathemas of the Pope, and by the threats and exclamations of the King of *France*, and diverſe other Biſhops and Potentates; He is beaten from his ground, ſwearing fealty to the Pope and his ſucceſſors, and admitting of Appeales to *Rome*. Long it was before hee would ſubmit himſelfe in this conteſtation betwixt a ſubject, and himſelfe to the Romiſh Tribunall, or yeeld to any condemnation being untryed, and unheard; and it appeares by the *Popes* forbearance of his laſt thūderbolt, that the Pope was diffident in his power, and durſt not ſentence him, if He had not yeelded before the ſentence. But I leave *Popery*, & come now to our reformed times. The dead time of night being now over, *Luther* began to crow in *Germany*, and to give notice of light ready to dawn upon the Earth: and no ſooner did that light appeare, but that diverſe Princes began to awake, and to ſhake off that blind ſervitude of *Rome* which had ſo long layne upon them, and lock'd up their ſenſes like a deepe ſleepe: How be it the light was not alike welcome to all, ſome fully and wholly gave it entertainement, others opened ſome Curtaines onely, and ſo yeelded themſelves to a little further ſlumber. *Henry* the eighth here in *England* was well pleaſed with that Doctrine which diſcovered his owne independence, and the weakeneſſe of the Popes Prerogative: but thoſe further monſtrous, deformed errors, and ſuperſtitions of *Rome*, which are founded upon its abſo-

lute Prerogative, and are as inconsistent with light, as the Prerogative it selfe; He tooke no delight to looke upon. So farre as his owne interest, and worldly advantage was represented by the beames of the Gospell, so farre his eyes thought it amiable And so farre Bishop *Gardiner* though a Bishop was ready to assist him: but so farre as his spirituall interest, and the generall advantage of his Subjects was concerned, so farre, Hee and *Gardiner* both could remaine as blind as Sir *Thomas More:* Tis wonderfull that so sharpsighted a man, as Sir *Thomas More* was, should lay downe his life in justification of the Popes supremacie; but tis more wonderfull that *Gardiner* should see the weakenesse of that supremacie, and yet still adhere to diverse other Popish superstitions as absurdly resulting from the same principles. The State of *Venice* also out of meere policy has long been at defiance with the Court of *Rome*, so farre as meere rules of Government guide, and direct it: but in all other spirituall deludions, and impostures it is as dead, as heavie-eyed, as ever. *Spaine*, *France*, and *Germany* also, though they speake not the same, yet they now doe the same as *Venice*, they all shut up and impale the Popes Authority within *Peters* Patrimony, leaving him no command but within his owne *Italian* territories, and yet besides his authority they cast off nothing else: so much doe we generally esteeme Earth before Heaven, and our temporall advantages before the substance of our soules. But let reason of State bee what it will, The Parliament here agrees to annex to the Crowne of *Henry* the eighth and his successors whatsoever sole, independent power was before challenged in Ecclesiasticall and Spirituall things by the Pope, or any Church-Man whatsoever: And *Hooker* seemes both to confesse and justifie the same, for sayes He, *Our Kings of* England *when they are to take possession of the Crown, have it painted out before their eyes, even by the very solemnities, and rights of their inauguration, to what affaires by the same Law their supreme power and authority reaches. Crowned we see they are, and Inthronized, and An-*

nointed

noynted, the Crowne a ſigne of Military dominion, the Throne of ſedentary or Iudiciall, The Oyle of Religious, and ſacred power. Hee here Attributes as ſupreme a rule, and as independent in Religious and ſacred affaires, as Hee does either in Military, or Iudiciall, and hee accounts that venerable Ceremony of Vnction, as proper to the Kings of *England* as that of Crowning, or Inthroning.

Nevertheleſſe, it is now a great objection againſt this chiefly of Dominion, that it may deſcend to Infants under age, as it did to King *Edward* the ſixth: Or to Women, as to Queene *Mary*, and *Elizabeth*, and whatſoever wee may allow to men, ſuch as *Henry* the eighth, yet it ſeemes unreaſonable, to allow it Women, and Children. The Papiſts thinke this objection of great moment, and therefore *Bellarmine* in great diſdaine caſts it out, that in *England* they had a certaine Woman for their Biſhop: meaning by that woman, Q. *Elizabeth:* And Q. *Elizabeth* her ſelfe knowing what an *odium* that word would draw upon her, both amongſt Papiſts, and many Proteſtants alſo, conſults her Biſhops about it, and by their advice ſets forth a declaration, certifying the world thereby, that ſhee claymed no other Head-ſhip in the Church, but ſuch as might exclude all dependency upon forreigne Head-ſhips, and ſecure her from all danger of being depoſed.

How this paper could ſatisfie all, I cannot ſee: My thinkes the Biſhops in this did as warily provide for their owne clayme, as the Queenes: for whatſoever power Shee had in the Church, it was either abſolute, Coordinate, or Subordinate. If it was ſubordinate, Shee was in danger of depoſition, and was to bee ordered, and limited, and commanded by her Superior. If her power was Coordinate; She had no more power over her equall, than her equall had over her: and it being as lawfull for her equall to countermand, as it was for her to command: her power would be as eaſily diſabled and made fruſtrate by her equalls, as her equalls by hers. In the laſt place therefore if her power

or headſhip were abſolute, why did not her Biſhops uphold and declare the ſame? Such dallying with indefinite expreſſions, and dazelling both our ſelves & others with meere ambiguities does often very great harme, for uncertainty in Law is the Mother of confuſion, and injuſtice, and this is the mother of uncertainty. According to this obſcure declaration of ſupremacy in the Queenes paper many Papiſts at this day take the Oath penned in the Statute for that purpoſe: they will abjure the Popes ſupremacy, as to depoſition of Princes: but not in any thing elſe: and they will hold the King ſupreme, as to all depoſers, but not as to all men elſe. Thoſe which are not bloudy, and dangerous, but by the light of nature abhorre regicides, reſt themſelves upon theſe ſhallow diſtinctions: but ſuch as are Ieſuitically furious, and murdrous, break through them as meere Cobwebs: and the more ſecure Princes are from the other, the leſſe ſafe they are from theſe. Theſe men will ſtill inſiſt upon abſolute ſupremacy ſomewhere to reſt; and that it cannot reſt in Women, or Minors, they will ſtill inſiſt upon this argument, If the Queene be not competent for that lower Order to whom the Word and Sacraments are committed, then ſhee is not competent for that higher Order which has power over the lower: but the Queene is not competent for the lower, therefore not for the higher. They ſay, that to preſcribe Lawes to Preachers is more than to preach: and to have power over Ordination is ſomething greater, than to enter into Orders, and therefore the Law cannot juſtly give that which is more, and greater, when God denyes that which is inferior, and leſſe. Our Divines make a very ſhort unſatisfying reply to this. Their reply is, that though our Biſhops owe ſome kind of ſubjection to Kings, yet the authority of preaching, *&c.* is not from Kings, but from Chriſt Himſelfe, Chriſt they ſay, giveth the Commiſſion, Kings give but a permiſſion only. All the power at laſt of our Kings, which is acknowledged equall with that of the Iewiſh, and has been ſo farre all this while magnified, and defended againſt Papiſts.

pists, inables them now no further, than to a naked permission in religious affaires, their most energeticall influence is permission.

Tis true, the Commission of the Apostle was from *Christ*, His *Ite & docete*, was their authority: And so it remaines still to all their successors; but is it therefore a reason, that there is now, no other Commission necessary? Where *Christs* Commission was particular, it was good without any other humane commmission, nay permission it selfe was not requisite: the Contents of that Commission was not only *Ito, Doceto:* but *Tu Petre, Tu Paule*, &c. *Ito, doceto:* but now there remaines nothing of that Commission, but the generality, *Ito, doceto:* the particularity requires now particular Commissions, and meere permissions will not serve the turne. And as for succession, we may suppose that our Saviours first Commission was vigorous, as to that purpose, but we must know, That the Apostles being both Governours and Preachers, all that commission which was given them as Governours, was not given them as Preachers. There must still be successors to the Apostles in Governing, and Preaching: but its not necessary that the same men now should succeed in both offices, and that whatsoever was commanded or granted to the one office, the same should bee granted and commanded to the other. The Civill Iudges and Councellors of State under the King are not without Generall Commissions from Heaven to doe justice, and preserve order in their severall subordinate stations, and yet they depend upon particular commissions too from Gods immediate Vice-Gerent. And it seemes to me a weake presumption, that Officers in Religion should have more particular Commissions from GOD, than Officers of State: or that Princes should bee more permissive, and lesse influent by way of power in the Church, than in the Common-Wealth. He that observes not a difference betwixt these times under Christian Princes, and those under unbeleeving *Cæsars*, is very blind, and He is no lesse, that thinks particular Commissions now as necessary when Princes

joyne

joyne to propagate the Gospell, as they were when supreme power was abused for its subversion: And so makes no difference betwixt a *Nero*, and a *Constantine*. Did *Constantine* gaine the style of Head-Bishop, or Bishop of Bishops meerely by permitting the true worship of God? And let us lay aside the strangenes of the Name, and apply the thing, I meane the same Episcopall power to Queene *Elizabeth*, as was to *Constantine* and what absurdity will follow? What is intended by the word ἐπισκοπεῖν, which may not bee as properly applyed to Queene *Elizabeth*, as to *Constantine*? If the Patriarchs, and Kings of *Iudah* and first Christian Emperors had jurisdiction, and a legislative power in the Church, nay had dominion over all those which did exercise judiciall power in the Church, and were so exalted in sanctity, and dignity above meere Priests, shall Queene *Elizabeth* bee barred and disabled for the same power and honour meerely by the prejudice of her Sex? The very Papists themselves do grant to some Abbatisses power of jurisdiction over some Ecclesiasticall persons, and this power they hold to be more honourable, than that of suborninate Monkes, and Priests which officiate under them; and yet to officiate they will not grant to Abbatisses, though they grant more than to officiate. Therefore wee see this rule doth not alwayes hold; that Hee which may not undertake the lesser charge, shall not undertake the greater; for the meere sanctity of the person is not alwayes that which gives Law in these cases. Though the person bee not voyd of sanctity, yet some other unfitnesse, and defect may stop and barre in lesse imployments, and yet bee no stop, nor bar at all in matters of a more excellent, and sublime nature. So it is with Infants and VVomen, though the possession of a Crowne be more sacred and honourable, than admission into Orders; yet they shall bee held more capable of a Crowne, than of Orders; because personall imbecillity, and naturall inferiority (as I may so say) is lesse prejudiciall in civill, than in religious affaires, and in matters of function and service, than in matters

of

of priviledge, and command. God had confined the right and honour of the Prieſt-hood amongſt the *Iewes*, to one Tribe, and Family onely, and therefore *Vzziah* might not invade that right, and honour to the infringing of Gods ſpeciall command, and in this reſpect *Vzziah* was qualified for a Scepter, yet not qualified for a cenſer; He was qualified for that authority which was more ſacred, yet not for that ſervice which was leſſe. So perhaps it is now under the Goſpell, women are expreſly barred from the Altar, that very Sex is preciſely excluded, and excepted againſt by God, they may not Miniſter in the Church: yet this is no exception, but that they may Raigne in the Throne, and yet this ſeemes not to prove that that miniſtration is more holy, than this raigning, but rather that it is more difficult, and ſuch as requires more perſonall ability, and naturall perfection. For let *Vzziahs* caſe over-rule us. That wth diſabled *Vzziah* for the ſervice of the Altar was not perſonall incompetence, or want of ſanctity: for then the ſame had diſabled him for all higher, and more excellent offices. But we know that *Vzziah* was not ſo diſabled: for he was capable of the Scepter, and by vertue of his Scepter, the whole Temple, and all the ſacred things therein, all the Order of the *Prieſts* and *Levites*, the whole Law of God, and the ſtate of Religion, and Policy, and the generall welfare of all Gods holy beloved people were within his guard, and protection, And will any man conceive this to be leſſe excellent, than to ſacrifice? By vertue of the Scepter *Moſes* did conſecrate Prieſts to ſerve at the Altar, and governe their ſervice at the Altar: by vertue of the Scepter *Salomon* did build, and dedicate the very Temple, and Altar it ſelfe, with his owne mouth, bleſſe both them, and thoſe Prieſts which were to attend them: by vertue of the Scepter, *Vzziah* himſelfe did inherit the ſame power, and holineſſe, and dignity which *Moſes*, or *Salomon*, or any of his Predeceſſors had, And ſhal all this ſeeme leſſe worthy and excellent to us, than to ſerve with a cenſer? In this *Hooker* fully concurres with me. He diſtinguiſhes betweene an Ordinary and a ſu-

preme Iudge, and He allowes it unfit for Princes to sit as Ordinary Iudges in matters of Faith and Religion: and yet hee denies not their supreme right and influence of judging. For (sayes He) an Ordinary Iudge must be of qualities, which in a supreme Iudge are not necessary, because the person of One is charged with that, which the others meere authority dischargeth, without imploying himselfe personally therein. It is an error to thinke that the Kings authority can have no force in doing that, which himselfe personally may not doe: for it is impossible, that at one and the same time, that the King should order so maine and different affaires, as by His power every where present are ordered in Peace and Warre; at home, and abroad.

And the King in regard of Nonage, *&c.* may be unable to performe that thing wherein yeares of discretion are requisite for personall action, and yet his authority is still of force: And therefore it is a maxime, that the Kings authoritie never dyes, or ceases from working.

Sundry considerations then may bee effectuall to hold the Kings person from being a doer of that, which notwithstanding his power must give force unto. In civill affaires nothing doth more concerne the duty, or better beseeme the Majesty of Kings, than personally to administer justice. Yet if it bee in case of Felony, and Treason; Lawyers affirme (*Stanford l. 2. c. 3.*) that well may the King commit his authority to an other, to judge betweene him, and the offender: but the King being himselfe there a party, cannot personally sit there to pronounce judgement. Here we see sometimes the King cannot be possibly present to act his part, sometimes defect of knowledge may hinder him, sometimes other exceptions, as being a party, and the like, may barre him from doing those things, which notwithstanding by his substitute power must bee done: and yet this preferres not substitutes before him. So in *Vzziahs* case, the Priest-hood was for very sufficient reasons in policy, severed from the Kingly office, and that by Gods owne approbation, and command,

Vzziah

Vzziah ſhall not now conjoyne, and unite them again out of a fond pragmaticall humor to the diſ-inheriting of the Tribe of *Levi*, to the diſſervice of the Crowne, to the hinderance of Religion, and to the violation of Gods command. If *Vzziah* will content himſelfe to move in his owne ſuperior Orbe, and leave the Prieſts of God to their owne regular ſubordinate motions, his influence ſhall give vigor to thoſe actions in them, which are with more honour to him done by them under his ſuperintendence than by himſelfe in perſon. For as the Ordinary Iudge deputed by the King, in caſes where the King Himſelfe either cannot be preſent, or hath not skill to determine, or may not legally intereſſe himſelfe, does give judgment, not by vertue of his owne, but by vertue of the Kings authority, and does therefore acquire more honour to his Majeſty, than to himſelfe: So in the Church the Prieſt miniſtring in that imployment, which in all places the King cannot miniſter in, and which is too difficult for ſome Kings to miniſter in, and prohibited to others, yet is not hereby greater or holyer than the King, but even in his very actuall adminiſtration it ſelfe, He is ſo dependent, and derives ſuch vertue from the Kings ſupreme, ſpirituall authority, that the King is ſupreme, and he but the ſecondary agent therein. But Biſhop *Bilſon* will yet ſay, that the Prieſt in the worke of converſion winnes the ſoule to a willing obedience, and that the Princes worke only by externall, politicall terror, which begets not *virtutis amorem*, but only *formidinem pœnæ*, and therefore it ſeemes that the worke of the Miniſter and the Prince, differ not only in order, but alſo in kinde, the one being far more ſpirituall and divine than the other. I anſwer hereunto, that if power doth only induce a ſervile feare of puniſhment, and ſo cauſe a forcible forbearance of ſin, and if preaching only make a voluntary conqueſt upon the ſoule, then by the ſame reaſon, the power of Biſhops as well as the power of Civill Magiſtrates is of leſſe value than preaching: but this none of our adverſaries will agree to. My next anſwer therefore is, that Preachers in the wonderfull worke

of regeneration are not in the nature of Phyſicall cauſes, they are rather in the nature of the meaneſt inſtrumentall cauſes under GOD: they are but as Veſſels in the hand of the Husband men, from whence the ſeed Corne is throwne into the ground. If the Corne fall into the furrow, and there fructifie, God opens and enlives the wombe of the Earth, God ſends ſhowres and influence from Heaven, God bleſſes the ſeeds with a generative, multiplying vertue, nay God caſts it into the furrow, from the mouth of the Preacher, and as He uſes the mouth of the Preacher, for the effuſion of his grain; ſo He uſes the Princes power as his Plough, to breake and prepare the ground: and in this caſe, the uſe and ſervice of the plough is as Noble, as that of the Buſhell.

Neither is the office of Kings the leſſe Glorious, becauſe they can uſe force; nor Miniſters the more Glorious, becauſe they may uſe none but ethicall Motives, and allurements: for power it ſelfe being a Glorious, Divine thing, it cannot bee ignoble to uſe it in Gods cauſe. And therefore wee ſee *Ioſiah*, and other good Kings are commended for uſing compulſion: and diverſe other Kings which uſed it not for the removing of Idolatry, and ſuppreſſing of the high places, did grievouſly offend God, and draw curſes upon themſelves, and their ſubjects. And whereas it is objected that force and compulſion reſtraineth only from the act of ſin, but reſtraineth not the will from the liking thereof. We ſee common experience teaches us the contrary. For *Scotland, Holland, Denmarke, Sweden, Bohemia, England, &c.* Suffered great changes of Religion within a ſhort ſpace, and theſe changes were wrought by the force of civill Magiſtrates, and could never elſe without ſtrange miracles from Heaven have been ſo ſoone compaſſed: but theſe changes are not the leſſe Cordiall, and ſincere, becauſe civill authority wrought them. Authority it ſelfe hath not ſo rigorous a ſway over the ſoules of men, as to obtrude diſliked Religions univerſally: it muſt perſwade as well as compell, and convince, as well as command, or elſe great alterations cannot eaſily, and ſuddainly

be

bee perfected. And in this respect the Proclamations of Princes become oftentimes the most true, and powerfull preaching that can be: and tis beyond all doubt, that if preaching were as a Physicall cause in the act of regeneration of sinners, or reformation of Nations, yet the edicts and commands of Princes are sometimes more efficacious Sermons than any which wee heare from out our Pulpits. For let us suppose that a considerable number of our Ministers were sent into *Mexico*, or *Perue*, to preach the Gospell of Christ, amongst the poore blinde Savages, could wee hope for so great successe thereby without the concurrence of some Princes there, as we might, if some of them would assist, and joyne to advance the same word and doctrine by their wisdome, and power, which our Ministers should publish with their art, and eloquence? If we cast our eyes back upon former times, also we shall see that before *Constantine* favoured Religion, the Gospell spread but slowly, and that not without a wonderfull confluence of heavenly signes and miracles, wrought by our Saviour, and his Disciples; all which we may suppose had never bin in such plentifull measure shewed to the world, had it not bin to countervaile the enmity and opposition of secular authority.

And it may be conceived, that had the *Cæsars* joyned in the propagation of CHRISTS Doctrine, more might have beene effected for the advantage of Religion by their co operation, than all Christs Apostles, Bishops, Prophets, Evangelists, and other Elders did effect by their extraordinary gifts and supernaturall endowments. We see also that *Constantines* conversion was of more moment, and did more conduce to the prosperity, and dilatation of Christianity, than all the labours, and endeavours of thousands of Preachers, and Confessors, and Martyrs which before had attempted the same. And to descend to our late reformations, wee see *Edward* the sixth, though very young, in a short time dispelled the mists of Popish error and superstition: and when no men were more adverse to the Truth than

the Clergy, yet He ſet up the banner thereof in all his Dominions, and redeemed millions of ſoules from the thraldome of Hell, and *Rome*. In the like manner Queene *Elizabeth* alſo, though a woman, yet was as admirable an inſtrument of God in the ſame deſigne, and what ſhe did in *England* diverſe other Princes about the ſame time did the like in many other large dominions: whatſoever was effected by miracles in the hand of Miniſters, after our Saviour, the ſame if not greater matters were ſooner expedited by the ordinary power and wiſdome of Princes, when Miniſters were generally oppoſite thereunto.

And as we ſee the ſpirituall power of Princes how ſtrangly prevalent it is for the truth, ſo ſometimes we ſee moſt woefull effects of the ſame againſt the truth. Religion was not ſooner reformed by *Edward* the ſixth, than it was deformed againe by Queene *Mary*. And though many godly Miniſters were here then ſetled, as appeares by their martyrdoms: yet all thoſe Miniſters could not uphold Religion with all their hands ſo ſtrongly as Queene *Mary* could ſubvert it with one finger of her hand onely. One fierce King of *Spaine* bound himſelfe in a curſed oath to maintaine the *Romiſh* Religion, and to extirpate all contrary Doctrines out of his confines: if many pious Miniſters could have defeated this oath, doubtleſſe it had not ſo farre prevailed, as it doth: but now wee may with teares bewaile in behalfe of that woefull Monarchy that one Kings enmity in Religion, is more pernicious, than a thouſand Miniſters zeale is advantagious. And by the way let all Princes here take notice what a dreadfull account of ſoules, God is likely to call them to: For is not the Clergy that are ſo immediately and generally reſponſible when Religion is oppreſſed, or not cheriſhed, and when ſoules are miſled, and ſuffered to goe aſtray, the abuſes of the very Clergy it ſelfe will be only ſet upon the Princes account, for according to that vaſt ſpirituall power which He hath put into their hands, yea according to that vaſt ſpirituall power, ſo will God certainly require at their hands. Let

Princes

Princes know that preaching is not the onely meanes of salvation, nor are Ministers the only Preachers, nor that the Sacraments are therefore efficacious because the Clergy only may administer them; Let them know that though Ministers call themselves only spirituall Persons, and the Lot of *God*, and the Church of Christ, and put them into the number of Temporall, and Lay-men, and limit them to secular things: yet God will not be so abused; they must make an answer to him for things most spirituall, and for the improvement of those graces and prerogatives which belong to Gods most beloved inheritance, and honoured servants, and neere Officers in his Church. And let Ministers also on the other side learne to acknowledge that Character of Divinity which is so much more fairely stamped upon Princes, than it is upon them, and let them not rob Princes of that influence in sacred things: which they of themselves can never injoy. For as Princes shall answer for them if they imploy their power to the depression of Ministers; so shall Ministers also answer for Princes if they cosen Princes out of their supreme power, out of pretense that Gods message is so delivered to them. Let Ministers assist Princes in their religious and spirituall offices, as *Aaron*, and *Hur* did *Moses*. Let them not contend for supremacy in the highest offices of devotion, but like humble servants let them account it their most supreme service, to attend upon that supremacy. Let them in the most glorious services of Religion looke upon Princes, as *Ioab* did upon his Master in martiall exployts. Let them be jealous of themselves, that no part of honour due to the independent power of Princes, may rest upon the secondary instruments, but returne to the first and highest movers. And thus shal more honour and sanctity passe from Ministers to Kings, and more efficacy and vertue from Kings to Ministers, and more grace and happinesse from both to the people.

Another occasion of mistake, and error in *Nazianzen*, and *Bilson* seemes to be, that in comparing the great fruits of Princes, and Priests, in their severall functions, they both

speake

speake of the whole order of Priest hood: as if every *Prince* were therefore lesse spirituall, or excellent than every Priest, because all Priests in some things excell some *Princes*. If we speak of a *Prince* and all the Clergy within his dominion, perhaps we may say he is *universis minor*, and yet he may be *singulis major*: perhaps he may not doe so much good in the Church as all his Clergy, yet he may doe more than a great number of them. And yet for my part, I am of opinion, that all the Clergie are so dependent, and borrow such vertue from the Kings supreme spirituality (as I may so say) that whatsoever good they doe, they ought not to let the honour thereof terminate in them, but returne to him upon whom they depend. And now I thinke, these things being made cleere, that Princes are sacred in respect of their supreme rule, and spirituall in respect of their spirituall rule, and that Priests have no proper rule at al over mens spirits, or in any Ecclesiasticall cases, but derivative, and subordinate to *Princes*. I may conclude, that there can be no office, nor action so sacred upon Earth, for which *Princes* are incompetent in respect of personall sanctity.

And therefore, as it is most erroneous to argue, that *Princes* are not capable of spirituall rule, because their persons are not holy enough: So it is most undenyably true, and we may safely argue, on the contrary, that no mens persons can bee more holy than such as God hath honoured, and intrusted with such supremacy of spirituall rule, as He hath done *Princes*.

THe next argument which raises the Miter above the Diadem is drawne from the power of the Church in Excommunication: and it is framed thus. That supremacy which makes Princes to be above the Church, and free from Ecclesiasticall censures, is absurd; but such is here

maintained, *Ergo:* by the word Church may be meant the Catholike Church, or some Nationall Church: The Church Triumphant, or the Church Militant: the Church which was from the beginning, and shall be to the end, or the Church which now is. We apply the Title of Head ship to Princes over no Churches but such as are under their present Dominions, and that Head-ship we account subordinate to Christs, and we allow with Saint *Ambrose* in some sense, that the King is *Intra*, and not *supra Ecclesiam:* For he is not such an universall supreme Head as Christ is, but is a member under Christ the Head. Yet this impugnes not, but that the King may in another sense be both *intra*, and *supra*, as to his owne dominions: for take the Church for Ecclesiasticall persons, and so the King may governe all under Christ, but take it for Ecclesiasticall graces, and so the King may be subject; He may be superior to Priests, yet acknowledge inferiority to Scripture, Sacraments, *&c.* And therefore with that of *Ambrose*, that of *Nazianzen* may well stand; Thou raigneſt King together with Christ: Thou ruleſt together with him; Thy sword is from him; Thou art the Image of God: And surely this is something more glorious than can be applyed in so proper and direct a sense to any Clergie-man whatsoever. But let us briefly see what this spirituall sword of Excommunication is, which the Church, that is, Church-men only clayme, and wherewith they thinke they may as freely strike Princes, as Princes may doe them with the temporall.

The grounds in Scripture for Excommunication, are severall, not all intending the same thing, yet all are blended and confounded by Clergie-men to the same purpose: whereas we ought to put a great difference betweene Excommunication, and Non-communication, and in Excommunication, betweene that spirituall stroke, and punishment, which was ordinary in case of contempt, and that which was extraordinary in cases of most hainous nature. Non-communication may be supposed to have beene from the beginning; and

by common equity; for Gemmes were never to be caſt to Swines, nor the priviledges and Treaſures of the Church to bee imparted to ſuch as were enemies and ſtrangers to the Church. Heathens and Publicans hated the Religion of the *Iewes*, and therefore it was hatefull to the *Iewes* to communicate with them, either in matters of Religion, or in offices of friendſhip. The *Iewes* did not forbeare all civill converſing with them, but all familiarity they did forbeare, and yet the forbearance of familiarity was no proper puniſhment to them: Nor was it a thing ſpiritually inflicted by authority, but by generall, and naturall conſent practiſed. So men of the ſame nature, as *Publicans* and Heathens now, *viz.* ſuch as hold our Religion contemptible, or whoſe profeſſion is ſcandalous to Religion, they ought to be to us as they were to the *Iewes*; to mingle familiarly with them cannot ſtand with our owne ſafety, or the honour of Religion, or the Law of common decency: but thoſe whom we account as *Publicans*, we doe not make *Publicans*, whom we ſhun as infectious, we doe not puniſh as rebellious: their actions we doe generally deteſt, but their perſons we doe not judicially condemne. Princes under the Law might not eate of the Shew-bread, nor approach the Sanctuary being in a polluted condition, nor in caſe of Leproſie might they be admitted into the Congregation of the Lord, ſo nor baſtards, *&c.* but theſe are all inſtances of Non-communion, not of Excommunication: and the reaſon of Non-communion is perpetuall, ſo that if Princes in open contempt of the Sacraments ſhould deſire them at the Miniſters hands, Miniſters ought rather to dye than to adminiſter them. But to deny the Sacrament is not any ſpirituall obduration, or caſtigation; to this denyall, no ſpeciall authority is neceſſary, neither to that authority is any coercive force inernally working upon the ſoule granted. *Cain* having commitred an unnaturall murther was generally abhorred amongſt his brethren and abandoned as unfit for humane ſociety: but this was a crime proper for the temporall ſword, and if this was a proper puniſhment it was temporall. And it

is plainly cleered to us, that adultery it selfe by Gods Law was punished by the temporall, not spirituall sword, and that *abscisio animæ* amongst the *Iewes* was ever spoken of corporall punishment by death, the infliction whereof was only left to the temporall Magistrate; and that there was no difference observed betweene Crimes Spirituall, and Crimes Temporall. Non-Communion, then we grant to have bin of ancient use, and perpetuall, but we wish great caution and circumspection to be had therein amongst Christians, for as visibly prophane persons are to be rejected, so no former profanenesse ought to be cause of rejection, where the party with outward professions of repentance, and gestures of reverence craves the mysteries at the Ministers hands, as almost all Christians doe. For in such case if the Sacrament, then the word also may be denyed, and so no manner of salvation shall be left to such as have bin formerly vitious, whatsoever their present demeanour be.

To come now to Excommunication, or the Spirituall Sword, and sentence of the Church, as it was used in the Primitive times, yet so wee finde differences of it amongst our Divines. That incestuous *Corinthian* which was said to be *traditus Satanæ*, as *Chrysostome* conceives, was not ejected out of the Church by ordinary excommunication, but was miraculously left to Satan, *ut percelleretur vulnere malo, aut morbo*, and such was the punishment of *Ananias*, and his Wife, and of *Elymas, &c.* according to *Ierom, Ambrose, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, &c.* This excommunication, if it may be called so, was a corporall punishment, and there is no appearance of any internall obduration by the binding power of the Minister: and it was miraculous, and therefore though it was of use then, when the Keyes of Church-men could not erre, and when a Temporall Sword was wanting, yet now it is utterly useless, and abolisht. For any other excommunication of present and perpetuall necessity in Ecclesiasticall regiment there is little proofe in Scripture, it is the spirituall Scepter of our *Hierarchists*, without which their

Empire would appeare meerely imaginary: and therefore their zeale is ſtrong for it, though their grounds be weake. It ſeemes to me a very darke deduction, that the Keyes of Heaven in the Goſpell muſt needs import reall power, and juriſdiction in Church-men, and onely in Church-men; and that that power and juriſdiction muſt needs intend ſuch a ſpirituall ſword, as our preſent form of excommunication is, and that that ſword is as miraculous as it was, or as uſefull, as if it were miraculous; and that the ſtroke of it is meerly ſpirituall, and not to be ſupplyed by the temporall ſword: and that Princes are as well lyable to it as other Lay-men. *Ierome* ſayes, that with God not the ſentence of the Prieſt, but the life of the ſentenced party is look'd upon, and regarded; and ſayes he, *Vt Leproſum mundum vel immundum Sacerdos facit, Sic alligat vel ſolvit Presbyter.* It ſhould ſeeme our Prieſts now have the ſame power to try and diſcerne ſcandalous perſons amongſt us, as the *Iewiſh* had Leapers in their times: and no man ſuppoſes that the *Iewiſh* Prieſts had any vertue, or force in their judgements to purge ſuch as were uncleane, or to infect thoſe which were cleane, they were held the moſt fit and impartiall judges, but the matter to bee judged of was viſible, eaſie, and ſenſible. So much as this, no man will deny to our Miniſters, for if they binde, and ſhut Heaven to perſons ſenſibly profan, not altering at all the condition of ſuch as they binde, and ſhut out, this is no ſuch ſtrange Spirituall Sword, and Celeſtiall power, and ſupereminent dominion, as they have hitherto pretended to, neither is it of any ſuch great conſequence in the Church of God.

But if Miniſters can yet by vertue of their Keyes, either ſearch into the reines and hearts of hypocrites, as the Apoſtles did, or alter the condition of ſuch as are ſubject to them, either by abſolving, or obdurating the guilty, or can effect any remedy in the Church for the taking away of ſcandall, by their ſpirituall power, which the temporall ruler doth not effect as the Apoſtles may be ſuppoſed to have done.

done; This is more than the *Iewiſh* Prieſts ever profeſſed, this is ſupernaturall, and wee ought to admire it. I doe not beleeve that our Miniſters will lay clayme to any ſuch miraculous vertue and infallibility, and if they did, I hope they would give us ſome ſignes and demonſtrations therof by opening Heaven to thouſands, and by confounding all incorrigible oppoſers of Religion. If *Nero* had reſorted to *Peters* miniſtery, deſiring to bee made partaker of the Word and Sacraments, out of fraud and diſſimulation, *Peter* doubtleſſe would not have refuſed him, and caſt him off, without a certaine inſight into his hypocriſie: but if *Peter* did diſcerne his hypocriſie, and reject him, yet our Miniſters cannot diſcerne the like, and therefore cannot reject in the like manner. With us take Excommunication, as a ſpirituall puniſhment, as it hardens, and drives from Repentance (for ſo the ſhutting of Heaven intimates) and our Miniſters ſhould bee cruell to uſe it where they are ignorant of the heart: and take it as a wholeſome remedy, and fit meanes to draw to repentance, as corporall puniſhments, ſometimes are (though it bee ſtrange to conceite the like of ſpirituall) yet their vertue being ignorantly applyed, is no proper vertue. For in caſe of utter impenitence, and open perverſeneſſe, Heaven is ſhut without the Miniſters power: and in caſe of fained penitence, the Miniſters Key cannot open effectually, though he diſcerne not the fraud: and in caſe of true penitence, if the Miniſter be miſtaken, yet Heaven will not remaine ſhut. Howſoever if Prieſts may now Excommunicate as they pretend, yet this concludes not, that they may excommunicate Princes. We know the Primitives did uſe excommunication, very moderatly, and tenderly, and not without great policy, and reſpect had to the good of the Church, and therefore Saint *Aug.* openly avers, that excommunication is a proud, pernicious, and ſacrilegious attempt, when it is denounced againſt any conſiderable number of people, *ubi periculum ſit ſchiſmatis*. We muſt know that it is of worſe example when it is uſed againſt *Princes*

than diverſe other great bodies and ſocieties: in as much, as one Prince is of more conſequence and power than thouſands of other Lay-men. We know alſo that in all judgments there is a neceſſity of legall tryall to precede conviction: and that great multitudes may be convented, examin'd, ſentenced, and puniſhed with leſſe diſturbance of peace, leſſe violation of Majeſtie, and leſſe obſtruction to policy, than thoſe which ſway the Ball imperiall. And if the condemnation of Princes might bee upon due tryalls without violence, yet the execution of the ſentence would produce more grievous and rigorous events in them, than in private men: for how ſhall the people honour, obey, and worſhip him in the State as Gods Lievtenan', whom they ſee accurſed, cut off, and abhorred in the Church as the Devils Vaſſall? That which was obtruded upon private men at firſt as a wholſom Corroſive plaiſter for their ſpirits, declined after into corporall penances, and after that into pecuniary mults: but what have beene the ſufferings of private men in compariſon of that which Princes have loſt hereby to the Clergie? Vpon the Excommunication of Princes, whole Nations have bin interdicted, whole States ruined, the innocent with the obſtinate, the Prince with the people all have bin ſacrificed to bloud thirſty Prieſts, under pretence of Obedience to the holy Church.

It will be objected, that if Princes be not this way puniſhable, they are no other way puniſhable, and that it is very miſchievous in the Church, that there ſhould be any ſcandall given, and no meanes left for its purgation, and expiation.

I anſwer, The *Iewiſh* Kings did ſinne in the moſt offencive manner that can be imagined; yet God aſſigned no ſpirituall Rulers for their Caſtigation, and the Heathen Emperors were alſo free from any coercive reſtraint or puniſhment, and this God ſuffered, and we muſt ſuppoſe, that if it had bin ſo extremely and publikely miſchievous, God would not have ſuffered it. Beſides, in civill tranſgreſſions of the Law Prieſts doe not uſually clayme juriſdiction (though Saint

Ambroſe

Ambroſe vindicated murder upon *Theodoſius*) for ſo their power would be as temporall, and as large as the Princes, and yet there is no reaſon why God ſhould not have left a judicatory to puniſh civill violations in all men whatſoever, as well as Eccleſiaſticall.

In the laſt place alſo, if ſcandal ſhal not remaine unpuniſhable in the ſupreme temporall Magiſtrate, yet it ſhall in the ſpirituall, and that is a miſchiefe of the ſame nature as the other. For if the King ſhall abide the judgement of this Biſhop, or that Conſiſtory, yet what judgment ſhal that Biſhop or Conſiſtory abide? If this ſpirituall ſupremacy reſt in any one, that one muſt be unpuniſhable: for two ſupremes are things incompatible: and if this ſupremacy reſt in more than one, this is not conſiſtent with Monarchy: for either the one or the other muſt be predominant, and tranſcendent. We reade that *Iuſtinian* did command the Clergy to be proceeded againſt by excommunication, ſuſpenſion, and deprivation, and we cannot deny this to be his right, and all other Princes in the like manner, when miſdemeanours are ſcandalous in the higheſt Cleargy-men, or Conſiſtories; and we know that ſuch command and conſtraint in *Iuſtinian* is more than to excommunicate, ſuſpend, or deprive. We may juſtly therefore inferre, that *Iuſtinian* having a power above excommunication, ought not himſelfe to be excommunicated, by thoſe which were under his power: for ſo the excommunication of the inferior would diſable the excommunication of the ſuperior. And ſince excommunication cannot be promiſcuouſly and oppoſitely uſed by two, one againſt the other, without variance, and confuſion, but either the one, or the other muſt be above excommunication, it is more reaſonable that the higher bee exempted, and priviledged than the lower. And ſo it is a ſtronge argument, that Princes are not liable to excommunication, becauſe even in the power of excommunication it ſelfe their function is more excellent, and their power more ſublime, than theirs is, which excommunicate under them, and at their command, the Prince doing herein

the

the nobler office------*quantum qui navem temperat, anteit--Remigis officium*----but when it is argued againſt Princes, that they may be excommunicated by Prieſts; becauſe they beare offices leſſe ſacred, and ſerve God in places leſſe glorious than Prieſts, the grounds are here utterly falſe, and repugnant to all right reaſon, and ſound Divinity. Let us not then doubt to ſubmit all things under one ſupreme on Earth, ſubmitting him to his ſupreme in Heaven; For it is no ſmall thing, as we imagine, in ſuch caſe to be left to the ſearching judgment of God, for God is not negligent of his office therein, nor need we doubt, or hold our ſelves utterly remedileſſe, whilſt we can ſay truly, *Omne ſub regno graviore regnum eſt.* And let us not miſtake our ſupreme on earth, for if God had intended to have left us a ſpirituall ſword and miraculous judicatory under the Goſpell, never before knowne, or uſefull to the world, and that of perpetuall neceſſity, doubtleſſe he would have left us ſome cleere command in Scripture, and not have involved his meaning in metaphors ſo intricate, and ambiguous.

THe next argument againſt the Soveraigne Dignity of Kings is this. If ſervants are to be meaſured by the degree of their Maſter whom they ſerve, they are the greateſt ſervants, which ſerve Chriſt: But Miniſters ſerve Chriſt: *Ergo,* This can decide nothing for Princes and Prieſts, ſerving both the ſame Maſter; The argument hath the ſame force for Princes, and for Prieſts, and if it be further ſaid, that Chriſt as a Prieſt, is greater than Chriſt as a Prince, and that Princes therefore ſerving under him as a Prince, are not ſo great as Prieſts ſerving under him as a Prieſt, I ſhall deny that to bee ſo, for Chriſt as Mediator was inferior to his Father, and all workes of his regiment over the Church

are

are not done by him as Mediator, but doe belong to his Kingly Office, and as to his Kingly power, He is equall with the Father.

THe next Argument therefore of truer force is this: There can be no office more sacred, or dignity more excellent, then such as is signified under these glorious Titles of *Gods*, *Starres*, *Angels*, *Embassadors*, *Rulers*, *Fathers*, *Stewards*, *Pastors*, *Leaders*, *Teachers*: but these glorious Titles are applyed to Ministers, *Ergo*. Wee will acknowledge all these Honourable badges given to Ministers, and duely given: and wee will acknowledge these no empty words without truth, and so make words and things contrary: and we will acknowledge the Function of Ministers to bee more venerable than any amongst men, besides that which beares the sword, the Embleme of Gods imperiall Majestie. But to such as are Gods sword-bearers upon Earth, we conceive Ministers ought to give place, and pay subjection, as humbly as any others. The preminence of Kings, we hold to be three ways manifest: in order, in measure, and in kind. In the very sanctity of the Priest-hood it selfe we conceive the ministration of Priests to be subordinate to Princes, inasmuch as to superintend in the most religious affaires is due to Princes, and to officiate only to Priests, and to superintend is more than to officiate.

Secondly, In measure we conceive Princes excell also, in asmuch as in religious affaires such Priests have the charge of such flockes, and such Bishops of such Priests: but all both Bishops, Priests, and flockes are under the Kings charge. And not only in religious affaires, but in civill also the authority of Princes is both intensive, and extensive many wayes, where Priests may not at all intermeddle. And though to governe Christians as Christians, be the most transcendent honour of Kings; yet to governe men, as men: and not only to governe but to governe well, is a thing of divine impression.

Thirdly, in kinde the regiment of Princes is far excelling, for the regiment of Kings is a true proper regiment assisted with reall power, decored with externall honour, founded in the generall consent of men, and blessed by the gratious influence of God, but the rule of Priests is but ethicall, or metaphoricall only, its utmost vigor is but perswasive, and is not at all coercive, either inwardly, or outwardly: and that subjection which it challengeth is not to it selfe, but to the Word and Sacraments, whereto it selfe rendreth as much, as it requireth from others. This generall answer might suffice, but to each particular Title we will briefly reply further. Ministers they are GODS, *viz.* to such as are under their cure: but then as they are GODS to others, so Princes are GODS to them. Thus *Moses* was a God to *Aaron*, though *Aaron* was a God to his inferiors. Ministers are Stars, but not in magnitude equall to the Sun; neither is their light and influence so independent as the Suns. Ministers are Angels, *viz.* upon earth, and their internall piety is like a shining rayment to them amongst men, but they serve under Gods on Earth, whose robes of Majesty are every way resplendent, as well externally as internally. Ministers are Embassadors, but all Embassadors persons are not of the like honour, nor all their Embassages of the like moment, nor all their Commissions of the like extent: and in all these respects, Preachers are inferior to *Princes*, being joyned to them, as *Aaron* was to *Moses* for a spokesman, or an Interpreter only. Ministers are Rulers, *viz. quoad vim directivam*, but not *quoad vim coactivam*. Ministers are Fathers, *viz.* such as have been Gods instruments to regenerate us, and so as Saint *Ierome* sayes, they are the Fathers of our soules, and perhaps, as *Chrysostome* sayes, in this respect they are more to be honoured than our naturall parents. But Ministers alwayes, and onely are not so our Parents, and they that are so our Parents, are not so physicall, and selfe efficacious causes as our naturall Parents are: but if they may challenge more honour than our fleshly Parents, yet this advances them

them not above Kings, who are both politicall, and Spirituall Fathers alſo. *Fabius* the Conſull, though he was to pay Honour and reverence to his naturall Father, yet he was to demand a greater meaſure of the ſame from him being his politicall ſon: and it did not miſ-beſeeme him to prefer the civill right before the phyſicall: Yet *Fabius* here was a meere Magiſtrate, and in that farre leſſe glorious than our Chriſtian Magiſtrates are; Miniſters are Stewards, but not the higheſt in the houſe of *God*; for *Princes* are Stewards alſo and only accountable to God, but they are accountable to *Princes* themſelves. And as Stewards doe provide food for thoſe, by whom themſelves are fed, and manage only but one part of their Lords affaires: ſo it is with Miniſters: under *Princes* Miniſters are Paſtors, Leaders, Teachers, their Doctrine is their food wherewith they comfort the people, their perſwaſion is the light wherewith they ſecure them from falling, they feede by their exhortations, and guide by their dehortations, but all theſe are offices of a ſervant, rather than priviledges of a Maſter, and even in theſe offices they are ſubordinate alſo. So the *Pilot* at Sea may have the ſafety of his *Prince* committed to his direction, charge, and rule: So the Commander in Warre gives order for all affaires of the battaile, aſſigning to the King Himſelfe a fit ſtation: So the Iudge in matters of Law by his juſt decree bindes the right of his owne Maſter: So the Phyſition limits and preſcribes rules of diet, and ſets downe Lawes of exerciſe to his Soveraigne Lord.

In all theſe caſes there is a kinde of Obedience due from Kings, and that obedience implyes ſome kind of inferiority: and yet this obedience of the King, doth not drowne the higher and greater obedience of the Subject, nor doth this inferiority contradict that which is of a farre other quality, and degree. In the ſelfe ſame manner alſo the Prieſt officiates in the Church, perhaps before the King, perhaps before his owne Metropolitan, at this time, in this place, and in this office, there is honour, reverence, and obedience due to him

from the King, and Metropolitan: yet this doth not exempt him from that ſtronger and holyer tye of ſubjection, awe, and ſubordination, by which he is alwayes bound to thoſe which governe him in other things; when *Ambroſe* therefore ſayes *Honor & ſublimitas Epiſcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari:* and againe, *Nihil poteſt eſſe in hoc ſeculo excellentius Sacerdotibus, nihil ſublimius Epiſcopis reperiri:* wee anſwer, if he here include Princes, as having Epiſcopall power, and a juriſdiction both over Prieſts and Biſhops, we agree hereunto, but if he exclude Princes, we exclude this from our beliefe. And againe when he ſayes: if you compare Epiſcopall ſublimity to the brightneſſe of Kings, or Diadems of Princes, that of Kings and Princes will be more inferior than leade, compared with gold: we anſwer, if he here intend the meere ſecular authority of Princes in things meerly temporall, we ſuppoſe ſome mild conſtruction may bee allowed: but if he ſpeake of the intire Soveraignty, and Prerogative of Princes, and put that as lead in compariſon of the golden Miter, we reject him as erroneous. That which *Chryſoſtome* ſayes, that more awe is due to Prieſts, than to Kings and Princes, we admit alſo in this ſenſe, *viz.* to the Embaſſages of God in their mouthes, not to their perſons: and thoſe Embaſſages alſo and inſtructions we oppoſe to the meere civill Ordinances of Kings, not to religious injunctions, wherein Princes are ſent with larger Commiſſion than they are. And whereas hee ſayes further of the power of Prieſts, that God Himſelfe would not impart it to Angels, or Arch-Angels: wee may adde alſo nor to *Princes:* yet this concludes nothing to the derogation of Angels, or Arch-Angels or Princes. For the Angels, *&c.* though they have not the ſame Miniſtery in the ſame kinde, and order, yet they have a more glorious and heavenly, and conſequently ſo may Princes. That which Saint *Auguſtine* ſayes alſo that Princes beare the Image of God, Biſhops of Chriſt, We willingly conſent to, and yet by Biſhops here we do not intend only ſuch Church-Governours as our Biſhops now in *England* are,

but

but all other such as doe the same offices over Gods people, whatsoever their stiles, or externall additions be otherwise. And these things we conceive ought to receive such constructions, because our Saviour Himselfe did alwayes decline all State and pompe, and recommend the same lowly president to his followers; with strict command not to exercise any Lordly Dominion, nor to assume the Name of *Rabbi* upon them, ever pressing this; That he came to serve, and not to be served. And yet in the meere Name of Lord, or *Rabbi* there could be no offence, if the power and grandour belonging to those names; had not bin displeasing to him: and if it was displeasing in those his immediate *followers* whom he had made governours as wel as Preachers, and for their better governing had indued with many miraculous gifts, to discerne spirits, and to open and shut Heaven: and inriched with many other weighty graces, we cannot imagine it should now be pleasing in our Ministers, where lesse power is necessary, and lesse vertue granted. However it is farre from our meaning to detract or derogate any thing from that internall reverence which is due to Christs Embassadors, and Stewards; *&c.* in the Church, we know that he that despises them, despises Christ Himselfe, according to Christs own words, our meaning is only to place them next and in the second seate of Honour after Princes, and Rulers, and Iudges which have Scepters committed to them by God, either mediately, or immediately. *Cyp.* sayes well, that our Saviour being King and God did Honour the Priests and Bishops of the *Iewes*, though they were wicked, for our instruction: we grant that our Saviour ought in this to be imitated, and that all Priests whether they have such command or no, as the *Iewish* had, or whether they bee Religious or no: yet for Christs sake which is our High-Priest, and their Head, we ought to pay all reverence and awe to them.

THe laſt Argument urged is this. That Order which is of the greateſt neceſſitie in Religion, without which no Church can at all ſubſiſt, is moſt Holy and excellent, but ſuch is the ſacerdotall order, for Religion had ſubſiſtence under the Apoſtles without *Princes*, and that it never had nor could have under *Princes*, without Prieſts: *Ergo*, This is no way true, for Religion can have no being without men, and men can have no being without government, and therefore as to this firſt, and moſt neceſſary being, wee may juſtly ſay, that the Goſpell it ſelfe was as well protected by *Cæſar*, which hated it, as by *Peter* which preached it: For *Peter* did owe his civill being to *Cæſar*, and without this civill being, his Eccleſiaſticall being had periſhed. Beſides *Peter*, *&c.* was not only a Preacher, but alſo a Governor, and thoſe offices which he did as a Governour, might be as much conducing to the welfare of Religion, as thoſe which hee did as a Preacher: and yet for want of the civill Magiſtrates further aſſiſtance, both offices were ſome way defective, and perhaps, had bin wholly unprofitable, had not miraculous gifts and graces ſuperabounded to ſupply that defect. Howſoever, it is more true, that after the Creation Religion did ſubſiſt under *Princes* onely without Prieſts, for untill the Prieſt-hood was ſevered in *Aron*, *Adam*, *Melchiſedeck*, *&c.* were not ſo properly Prieſts, as *Princes*: for though they performed the offices of Prieſts, yet they had no other Conſecration to inable them therefore, than their Regall Sanctity, and ſublimity. If the meere officiating did make a Prieſt, then the Prieſt-Hood were open to all: and if ſome right and warrant be neceſſary, it muſt orginally flow from *Princes*, and they which may derive it to others, have it, till they derive it, in themſelves. The eſſence of Prieſt-Hood doth no more conſiſt in the rites and Ceremonies

nies of Consecration, than Royalty doth in Coronation: and the due warrant of lawfull authority being that essence, before that warrant granted, we must looke upon authority as including that warrant within its vertue: and after that warrant granted, as not exhausted of its vertue. When the Priest-hood was separated from the greater, and confered upon the inferior, some formall Ceremonious resignation therof was thought necessary: but before that resignation till *Moses*, wee may well conceive that Princes did officiate in their owne rights, without borrowing any thing therein from Ceremonies, or from any higher power than their own.

I have now done with Arguments of the first kinde, which are urged against the sanctity, and competence of Princes, in Ecclesiasticall and Spirituall things. I come now to answer such things as are further objected against other defects of qualification in them, especially in learning, knowledge, and theologicall understanding.

THe maine argument here, is thus: Whosoever is fittest to direct to Truth, is also fittest to command for Truth: but Ministers being most skilld in Divinity are most fit to direct, *Ergo*.

In answer hereunto, I must make appeare.

1. That Ministers are not alwayes most learned.

2. That the most learned are not alwayes the most judicious.

3. That learned and judicious men are not alwayes Orthodox, and sound in faith.

4. That there is no necessitie in policy, that the most learned, judicious, and sincere men should be promoted to highest power in the Church.

And first, we deny not that the blessing of God doth usually accompany the due act of Ordination, to adde gifts and abili-

abilities to the party ordained: we only say, that Gods grace like the winde hath its free arbitrary approaches and recesses, and is not alwayes limited, or necessitated by the act done of consecration. And we say also, that as God usually sanctifies Ministers for their function, so he doth also Kings: and when he did lay his command upon Kings to have a Copy of his Law alwayes by them, to reade and study it for their direction, we conceive it is intimated to us what kinde of knowledge is most fit for Kings, and what kinde of grace God doth most usually supply them withall. *King Edward* the sixth, Queene *Elizabeth*, and *King Iames* of late, and happie memory were so strangly learned and judicious in Divinity, that we may well thinke there was something in them above the ordinary perfection of nature: and had they perhaps relyed lesse upon the greatest of their Clergie in matters concerning the interest and honour of the Clergie, the Church might have been more free from these controversies, and disturbances at this day.

Counsellors of State were by a wise King of *Spaine* compared to Spectacles, and so may Prelates also, but as the same King well observed, those eyes are very wretched which can see nothing at all without them. Tis as much wisdome in Princes to look into the particular interests of Counsellors, and not to be too light of beliefe, as tis to do nothing without counsell and to suspect their owne imaginations. If we did attribute to our Iudges a freedome from all fallibility and corruption, and so intrust all Law into their hands, this would be as dangerous, as to allow Iudges no credit at all. The Anabaptists which rely only upon their own private Enthusiasmes are not mislead into greater idolatry, and slavery than the Papists, which renounce their owne light, and reason, to cast themselves wholly upon the directions of their Ghostly Fathers. Our Prelates at this day have not so rigorous an Empire over our beliefe as the Papists grone under, yet they have given us a taste of late, what Canons should be held most religious and fit for us, if we would admit all to bee indisputable:

disputable: which they thinke fit to bee imposed upon us. And truely when Clergie men were confessed to be the only Oracles and infallible Chaires of Divinity in the world, twas but a modest Law my thinkes, that all Lay-men being on Horse-backe, and meeting Clergy-men on foote, should perpetually dismount, and resigne their horses to Clergie-men; sure those times which thought this reasonable, and just were prety modest times, and Lay-men did not deserve so good. In the second place also admit Clergie-men to be only and alwayes learned, yet the learnedst men are not alwayes the wisest, and fittest for action. Sometimes where great reading meets with shallow capacities, it fumes like strong Wine in their heads, and makes them reele, as it were, under the burthen of it: it causes sometimes greater disquiet both to themselves, and other men. In our Ancestors dayes when all learning was ingrossed by the Clergie, and thrust into Cloysters, and Colledges from the Laity, yet there were many grave and wise Statesmen that were as an allay to the insolent, and vaine excesses of the Clergie, or else this State had bin often ruined. But admit in the third place, that Clergie-men are alwayes more learned and wise than all Lay-men, yet we see they are not more free from errors, heresies, and jars amongst themselves, than other men, but rather lesse. When Schismes rise amongst Divines, as they doe almost perpetually, Divines being thereby banded, and divided against Divines, what can the poore Laicke doe? both sides he cannot adhere to, and if he adhere to this, that side condemnes him, and if to that, this condemnes him: if hee make use of his judgment herein, than hee trusts himselfe more than the Priest, and if he use not his judgment at all; He commits himselfe meerly to fortune, and is as likely to embrace the wrong, as the truth: if he apply himselfe to the Major party, that is hard somtimes to discern; and if it be discernable, yet it is many times, the erroneous party. The Papists are not the major part of Christians, Christians are not the major part of men, The orthodox amongst us are not the major part of *Calvinists* *Calvinists* are not the Major part of Protestants.

Before the Law the Minor part worshipped the true *God*, and amongst those which worshipped the true God, the Minor part were heartily his servants, and made a Conscience of their wayes. After *Moses* also when the *Iewes* began to mingle with the *Canaanites*, and other bordering Heathens in the manner of their sacrifices and high places, a very small part sometimes kept it selfe pure from those pollutions, and innovations. And in that great rent under *Ieroboam* ten tribes of twelve estranged themselves from God, set up a new spurious false worship in *Bethel*. And we reade long before the Captivity, that *Ephraim was divided against Manasseh, and Manasseh against Ephraim, and both against Iudah*. *Iudah* also it selfe was never wholly untainted, for from the Captivity, sundry sects, and factions had distraited it, in so much that when our Saviour came into the world, there was scarce sincerity or truth to be found, and that that was, was not most eminently amongst the greatest Scribes, Pharisees, or Priests. In all those times if there was such an infallibility in the Chayre of *Moses* (as the Papists dreame of) it did but little availe the world, for he that then would have sought for the true way to walke in, disclaiming utterly his owne light and understanding, He must not have sought it amongst the multitude: and if he had sought it amongst the Priests, he would have seene divisions there: and if amongst Prophets, Hee would have found the same there also. God did not deliver Oracles, nor inspire Prophets, at all times upon all occasions for the ceasing of differences, and contestations; He did appeare in love, but not without all Majesty; He did shew grace, but not according to obligation. After our Saviours Ascension a blessed Spirit of infallibity did rest upon the Church to direct in intricate debates, and to prevent schimes, till a perfect Gospell was establisht: but this Spirit in those very times had not residence in any one mans breast at all times, to give judgment in all things. The greatest of the Apostles might severally vary and dissent in points of great concernment, and therefore they had consultations sometimes, and

when

when consultations would not satisfie, they did assemble in a greater body; and when those assemblies were, the wisdome of the Spirit did not alwayes manifest it selfe in those which were of highest order, but sometimes the inferior did reprove and convince the superior, and the superior did submit, and yeeld to his inferior. But after one age or two, when the Spirit of God had consummated, the maine establishment of Religion, though it preserved the Church from a totall deviation, it secured not all parts thereof from all grosse prevayling rents, and Apostasies, neither did it affixe it selfe, or chuse any certaine resting place in any one part of the world more than an other. Three ages being now runne out, heresies of a foule nature beginning to spring up and increase with Religion, it pleased God to send *Constantine* to ayd the truth against error, and impiety: in his power now it was to congregate Bishops of the best abilities, for the discussing and discovering of truth, and for the upholding the same being discovered. When Bishops contended against Bishops, and Presbyters against Presbyters, and when Arianisme was defended by as great a number of Divines as it was opposed, so that from the wisdome of Divines, no decision could be expected, then doth the power and policy of one Emperor, by Divines remedy, that, which a thousand Divines by themselves could never have remedyed. From the Bishop of *Rome* the Orthodox party could obtaine no succour, till *Constantines* Scepter proved more vertuous than his Crosiers: and when the Councell was by *Constantine* called, and ordered, the Bishop of *Rome* was not the onely Oracle in that Councell, neither had that great trouble of assembling been, if one Bishop had then bin more oraculous than all. The same offices also which *Constantine* did in his dayes, many other godly Emperors did in their raignes: and had not they done them, no one Bishop could; for the Catholike Bishops were many times inferior in number, and power to the Heretikes: and if the Pope had then had the power to utter Oracles, yet not having power to inforce, and authorise the same upon all

opposites, hee could not have advantaged Religion amongst Heretikes, more than hee doth now amongst Protestants, Iewes, Turkes, or Pagans. If God gave infallibility to one Bishop, for the availe of all the world, why doth not that Bishop availe the whole world? Why is so great a light put under a Bushell? Why are not all men illuminated by it? And if God had no regard therein but to that remnant which worships the Pope, if his only ayme therein was at the salvation of Papists, why is this made a ground of universall authority to the Pope, or of generall priviledge to all Bishops? But I am to speake now to Protestants which hold no one Bishop infallible, but the whole order of Bishops freer from fallibility, than any other condition of men: therfore to such, I shall instance in *Rome* it selfe what multitudes of Divines; of learned, profound Divines; of politike, Sagacious Divines for many ages together have beene drunke and bewitched with the superstitions, Idolatries, blasphemies, and heresies of that inchanting City? Can it bee thought safe for Princes and Lay-men wholly to abjure their owne understandings, and yeeld themselves Captives to the dictates of Divines only, when so many Millions of them for so many ages, notwithstanding all their exquisite learning and rare abilities, devote themselves to such sottish impostures, and grosse impieties, nay to some such infernall, diabolicall tenets? Can men still persist to give up their judgements wholly to other men for their callings sake, or for their learning and wisdome supposed, when we see this is the very same rock, whereupon *Rome* suffers Ship-wrack, and this blind opinion the very snare wherein so great a part of the world still lies intangled? But I will avoyde prolixity.

And now in the fourth place, I come to shew, that if we will take all these things for granted, and ascribe all learning, knowledge, and freedome from variance to all Clergie-men and to Clergie-men only, yet it doth not follow that they are necessarily to rule, and command in chiefe. Nay I shall make it appeare, that it is not only not necessary, but that it is ma-

ny

ny wayes mischievous, that the ablest Divine should alwayes be supreme in all causes, and over all persons Ecclesiasticall. Power and wisdome are things of a different nature, for power cannot stand with inferiority, but wisdome may be as efficacious in a man of meane condition as in a man of high quality; and power if its supremacy be divided, it is diminish.d: but wisdome the more it is dispersed, the more the vertue of it is increased. Wisedome often is contented to serve, and to accept of a low dwelling, but power ceases to be power if it dwell not in sublimity, and have honour to attend it. To be wise, and to be contemned, dejected, suppressed are things comparible, they are things frequent: but to be potent, is the same thing as to be great, to be sacred, to bee a commander of other mens wisdome: Nay to be potent hath no terme convertible, but to be potent. Power in the State, is preserved as the Arke was in the *Iewish* Church, it is privileged from common sight, and touch in all well constituted Common wealths, it is united in some one person only, and to him so lineally intayled, that it may never dye, never cease, never suffer any violent motion, or alteration. Power is as the soule of Policy, of so exquisite, and delicate sense, that nothing but the wings of *Cherubims* is fit to guard and inclose it, from all rude approaches: vacuity in nature is not a thing more abhorred, or shunned with greater disturbance, and with greater confusion of properties, than the least temeration, and eclipse of power in the State. How absurd then is this axiome, which makes power servile to wisdome, not wisdome to power, wch subjects power to so many translations, & competitions, and cessations, as often as time shall discover such and such excellencies in such, and such men? If power shall always be at the devotion of such men, as for the present appear most wise, if she shal be made so cheap, and vulgar, and prostituted daily to so many uncertainties, what quiet can she procure to the world? Nay what bloud will she not procure? I need say no more: this axiome is neither consistent with Monarchicall, nor hereditary rule.

For first, if the most knowing Divine shall alwayes be supreme Commander in all Church affaires (for more than this the Pope never claymed) then by the same reason the most knowing Statesman shall be supreme in the Palace, the most knowing Souldier in the Campe, the most knowing Lawyer in the Tribunall, &c. and so Monarchy shall be changed not into the aristocracy, or democracy, which are formes not utterly corrupt, but into poly-coirany, than which nothing can be more unpoliticke.

All Nations have ever rejected this broken confused rule of many severall independent Commanders, which cannot chuse but injoyne impossible things sometimes: for all these commanders may at the same time use the same mans service in severall places, and in this they never can be satisfied: wherefore we may well account this rule as bad as anarchy it selfe. Nay even Religion it selfe by this meanes may be distracted into severall supremacies, for He that is the ablest Divine in polemicall points and in deciding controversies, may not be ablest in positive points, or matters of Discipline, and yet here the one hath as good title to absolute power in his sphere, as the other hath in his. And as Monarchy cannot, so secondly, neither can hereditary right stand with this alwayes uncertaine, variable title of ability, and excellence in knowledge. Nay possession of supremacy is here no good plea: For he that was the greatest, and most knowing man last yeare, is not so this yeare, neither perhaps will he be next yeare, that is so this yeare. A thousand incongruities and inconveniences attend upon this paradox: for the abilities of men are very hardly tryable, and discernable: and if they were not, yet the subjecting of power to the perpetual, giddy changes of new elections would soone confound us into our old Chaos againe, as the Poets word is.

The three principall acts of power are,

Firſt, to make Lawes.

Secondly, to give judgement according to Lawes made.

Thirdly, to execute according to the right intent of judgments.

In

In the making of Lawes alſo according to *Tully*, there is three things neceſſary: 1. *Invenire.* 2. *Diſceptare.* 3. *Ferre.* The invention of all neceſſary Lawes is almoſt perfect alreadie to our hands; Thoſe Lawes which God ordained for the *Iewes*, and thoſe which our Anceſtors found out for us, are daily before our eyes, and little can now be added of moment, except only for illuſtration of what was ambiguous before. In the Church alſo is leſſe want of perpetuall alterations, and additions of Canons, than in the State, our miſery is, that we ſucceed Anceſtors which were oppreſt with too vaſt a Church diſcipline. Our reformation hath rid us of ſome part of this burthen, but yet no ſenſible man can chuſe but ſee, that our Eccleſiaſticall Courts are yet of larger juriſdiction, and fuller of trouble, then ever the *Iewiſh* were, or thoſe of the Primitive *Chriſtians*. The reaſon of this is, becauſe wee ſtill rely too much upon Divines herein, and they for their own profit, and power are ſtill as willing to uphold their own Tribunals as ever they were. Did they thinke it a greater honour to ſerve at the Altar than in the Conſiſtory, and did they take more delight in Preaching, than attending ſuites, they would not ſtudy New Canons, but diſcharge themſelves of man old ones: and ſo eaſe themſelves and us too, and reſtore backe againe to the Civill Magiſtrate that which Popery firſt uſurped, and their ambition hath ſince continued. Howſoever if Miniſters can adde any Articles to the Doctrine of our Church for the better preventing of Schiſmes, or frame any orders for the more decent performance of Gods worſhip in the Church, I would not exclude them from propoſing it; I only deſire that ſince they are men, and may have private intereſts and reſpects to the prejudice of other men, they may not ingroſſe all power of propoſing what they liſt, and to exclude all others from the like power.

And in the ſecond place, if Clergie men only ſhall propoſe all Eccleſiaſticall Lawes; yet it is moſt unjuſt that Princes, and Lay-men ſhould be held utterly uncapable of ventilating, and debating the ſame.

Id quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari debet. Nature hath printed this in us, if the Priest propose any thing tending to the disservice of God, that disservice will draw the same guilt upon me, and all others, as upon him, and it shall not excuse me or others, that he pretended his judgment to be unquestionable; and shal it then here be unlawfull for me and others to use any endeavour for the prevention of this guilt? If Angels from Heaven should seduce me, I were inexcusable: and when Ministers, whom I know to bee subject to the same naturall blindnesse, and partiality as I am, and to whom I see generall error may be a private advantage, in matters of this private advantage, shal I be allowed no liberty to search, and trye, and to use my best art of discussion? If this were so, *God* had made my condition desperate, and remediless, and I might safely attribute my error, and destruction to the hand of God alone: but this no man can imagine of God without great impiety. God hath declared himself contrary herein, for he hath exempted none from error though never so learned, nor leaves none excusable in error though never so unlearned: if we will blindly trust others, tis at our own perill; He will require it at o r hands; but if we will seeke industriously, we shall finde, if wee will knock at his dore, He hath promised to open to us. And if private men stand accountable for their owne soules, whatsoever the Priests doctrine or commands be, how much more shall Princes, and Courts of Parliament answer for their wilfull blindnesse, if they will depart from their owne right and duty in sifting, and examining al such religious constitutions, as concerne them, and all others under their charge? Shall they sit to treate of Lether, and Wooll, and neglect doctrine and discipline? Shall they consult of the beauty and glory of the kingdom, and transfer Religion to others, which is the foundation of all happines? Shall they be follicitous for transitory things, and yet trust their soules into other mens hands, who may make a profit of the same? Let us not so infatuate our selves, let us honour Divines, and reverence their counsels, but let us not superstitiously adore them, or dotingly in-slave our selves to their edicts.

The

THe 3d. thing in making of laws is that which we term *ferre Legem:* and till this act of carrying, passing or enacting give the binding force of Law to it, how good and wholsome soever it be after all debate, yet it is but as the counsell of a Lawyer, or the prescription of a Physition. And here we maintaine, that if Divines are the most fit, to invent, and discusse Ecclesiasticall Constitutions, yet they have not in themselves that right and power which is to imprint the obliging vertue of Lawes upon them. The forme or essence of Law is that coercive, or penall vertue by which it bindes all to its obedience: and all cannot be bound to such obedience, but by common consent, or else some externall compulsion: take away this binding vertue, and it is no Law: it is, but a Counsell, wherein the inferior hath as much power towards his superior, as the superior hath towards his inferior. If then Divines will vindicate to themselves a Legislative power in the Church, they must deduce the same either from the common consent of the Church, or from some other authority to which all the Church is subject, and to which the whole Church can make no actuall opposition. If they clayme from common consent, they must produce some act of State, and formall record to abet their clayme, and common consent must also still strengthen the same, or else by the same that it was constituted; it may still be dissolved; and if they clayme from some higher externall authority, stronger than common consent, they must induce that authority to give vigor to their Lawes, and to use means of constraint against all such, as shall not voluntarily yeeld obedience to the same. And it is not sufficient for them to alledge God for their authority, without some speciall, expresse words from Gods owne mouth, for God gave no man

a right, but he allowes him some remedy agreeable thereunto, and God is so great a favourer also of common consent, that though hee hath an uncontroleable power above it, yet (as *Hooker* observes) He would not impose his owne profitable Lawes upon his people, by the hands of *Moses*, without their free, and open consent. And if God, which cannot doe unjustice, nor will impose lawes, but such as are profitable to us, and yet hath an undisputable Empire over us, will so favour common consent; shall man which may erre, and doe injurie, and is of lesse value then communities, and wants might to inforce and put in execution his owne commands, usurpe that which God relinquishes? Take it for granted that Priests cannot erre out of ignorance; or be perverted by private interest, and that they are superior to all Christians under their charge: yea grant them a right to make what Canons they please, and grant them no power to compell obedience to the same, and to punish disobedience to the same, and this would take away peace, and cause much mischiefe and disturbance every where, and this we cannot thinke God would be the Author of.

How ridiculous are the Popes anathemaes to those which renounce his allegiance, they seem to us but meere Epigrams sent abroad to provoke laughter? And yet why doe they not appeare as ridiculous in *Italy*, as in *England*? were it not for common consent, they were not in more force amongst *Italians*, then *Englishmen*: and there is no more true naturall vigor in the Popes Bulls, to procure common consent in *Italy*, then in *England*: we may gather then from hence, that there is no Ecclesiasticall Supremacie, but founded upon the same basis of common consent, as temporall supremacie is, and being so founded, it cannot be Divine, or unalterable, or above common consent so as to have any efficacie without, much lesse against it. That some Nations are gull'd, and cozen'd out of their consents, is no president for us, for as many Nations are addicted to *Mahomits* commandes, as are to the Popes: and in this the dominion of *Mahomet* is as spirituall as the Popes:

and

and is as ſtrong a caſe to over-rule us, as the Popes: for if conſent were to be forced, the Pope might as well force *Mahometans*, as Chriſtians: and if it be free, his Empire depends as much upon it, as *Mahomets*. They then that have erected a Spirituall ſupremacie, not depending upon common conſent, have been in a great error, and they that ſlight common conſent, as not capable of a ſpirituall ſupremacie, ſeem to have been as much miſtaken. Many of our Divines ſay, that Parliaments are temporall Courts; and ſo not of ſpirituall juriſdiction, and others ſay, that they may as well frame acts to order the Hierarchie in heaven, as to diſpoſe of Eccleſiaſticall things on earth: both theſe ſeeme to me verry erroneous. The Argument methinks is equally ſtrong: as God would not give a right to binde up other men by Statutes and Commandements, but he would give ſome power withall to drive men by conſtraint to obſerve, and yeeld obedience to the ſame: ſo He would not indue any Prince, or Court with ſuch power, but He would give a right of binding equall, and congeniall to that power. Princes of themſelves are ſacred, as I have proved, and ſpiritually ſacred; how much more then are they accounted ſitting in Parliament: and if Princes in Parliament, how much more Princes, and Parliaments; for to Princes on their awfull Tribunalls, is ſomething more due then at other times, but to Princes in Parliament, there is moſt of all due, in regard that there they are inveſted with more then their owne naturall power, common conſent having not derived all power into the King: at any other time, or in any other place: but reſerved much thereof till a full union be in Parliament; beſides, ſetting aſide the ſanctity of power in Parliaments: yet in regard that they are aſſiſted with the beſt counſell of Divines, ſo they ought not to be accounted meere Temporall Courts: for what better adviſe can thoſe Divines give out of Parliament: then in Parliaments: Some Parliaments in *England* have made ſome Eccleſiaſticall acts, *excluſo clerò*; nay that which was the the moſt holy act, which ever was eſtabliſhed in *England*, *viz.* The Reformation of

Religion, was passed *invito clero*: and when these things are not only legall, but honorable, shall we limit Parliaments in any thing wherein the votes of the Clergie are concomitant, and concurrent, with the Laytie? *Hooker* sayes, that the most naturall and religious course for the making of Lawes, is, that the matter of them be taken from the judgement of the wisest in those things whom they concerne, and in matters of God (he saies) it were unnaturall, not to thinke the Pastors of our soules a great deale more wise than men of secular callings: but when all is done for devising of Lawes, it is the generall consent of all, that gives them the forme, and vigor of Lawes. This we allow of for the most part, but wee conceive this to be understood of such Divines, as in the judgement of Parliaments, are *omni exceptione majores*; for it was not unnaturall in the beginning of the Reignes of *Edward* the Sixth, and Queen *Elizabeth*, to thinke that the Lords and Commons were better Judges of Religion, than the Bishops and the Convocation-house, as matters then stood in *England*. For the whole body can have no sinister end, or interest to blinde them: but the whole Clergie, which is but a part of the whole body may, and therefore the whole body is to judge of this, and when they see a deviation in the Clergie, and observe the occasion of it, they must not blindly follow blinde guides, but doe according to that light which God hath given them. And certainly, it were contrary to that interest which every man hath in the Truth, that any should be obliged to receive it from other mens mouths, without any further inquiry, or judgement made upon the same, The meanest man is as much interessed and concerned in the truth of Religion, as the greatest Priest, and though his knowledge thereof be not in all respects equally easie: yet in some respects it may be easier, for want of learning doth not so much hinder the light of the Laymen, as worldly advantage, and faction sometimes doth the Priests. Examples of these are infinite: corruption in the Church before our Saviour, and in our Saviours daies, and ever since hath oftner begun amongst the

the greateſt Prieſts, Rabbies, and Biſhops, than amongſt the meaner Laitie. And for this cauſe, God requires at every mans hands an account what doctrine he admits, what Lawes he obeys, holding no man excuſed for putting blinde confidence in his ghoſtly Father, and not taking upon him to weigh and try how ſure his grounds were. And if every private man ſtand ſo reſponſible for his particular intereſt in the Truth, being equally great in the Truth? ſhall not whole States and Nations, whoſe intereſt is farre greater than their Prieſts or Biſhops is, give a ſadder account to God, if they leave themſelves to be ſeduced by ſuch men, which are as liable to error as themſelves? If wee conſider the meere matter of Lawes, they are either profitable for the Church, or not: if they are profitable, why ſhould wee thinke that Princes and Parliaments want power to impoſe Lawes upon themſelves, for the availe of their owne ſoules, they ſtanding to God accountable for the ſame, according to the greatneſſe of their owne intereſt? and if they are not profitable, there is no obedience due to them, whether Prieſts, or *Princes* make them, and that they be not profitable, is equally doubtfull whether *Prieſts*, or *Princes* make them. Take then Lawes to be queſtionable, as all humane are, and lyable to examination: and being made without common conſent, they binde not at all, and being made by common conſent, they binde all either to obedience, or to ſufferance. It is Gods owne Law, that ſuch as ſhall except againſt the validity or obliging vertue of common conſent, ſhall die the death: for no peace can ever be in that State where any inconſiderable partie ſhall not acquieſce in the common Statutes of the land. Thoſe Lawes which Heathen Emperors made by common conſent againſt Chriſtianity, were not wiſe Lawes, But they were Lawes, there was no pietie, but there was vigor in them: and doubtleſſe the very Apoſtles, which might not lawfully obey them, yet might not lawfully contemne them. Two things are objected againſt the Eccleſiaſticall power of Parliaments. 1: That it is more due to *Princes*. 2. To Councells, or Synods.

'Tis

Tis true anciently Princes were the only Legiſlatives: the old rule was, *Quicquid placuerit Principi Legis habet vigorem.* But we muſt know, that Princes had this power by common conſent, and doubtleſſe till policy was now perfect, and exquiſite twas ſafer for Nations to depend upon the arbitrary, unconfined power of Princes, then to have their Princes hands too far bound up, and reſtrained, but ſince Lawes have bin invented by common conſent, as well to ſecure Subjects from the tyranny of their owne Lords, as from private injuries amongſt themſelves: and thoſe Common-wealths which have left moſt ſcope to Princes in doing of good offices, and the leaſt in doing acts of oppreſſion, are the wiſeſt but ever this golden axiome is to bee of all received: That that is the moſt politicke prerogative which is the beſt, but not the moſt limited. But this objection makes for Parliaments, for whatſoever power was veſted before in Princes and their Councells, the ſame now remaining in Princes and the beſt, and higheſt of all Counſells, *viz.* Parliaments Counſells, alſo and Synods, are as improperly urged againſt Parliaments, for Counſells and Synods did not at firſt clayme any right, or in dependent power, they were only called by the ſecular Magiſtrate, as Eccleſiaſticall Courtes for the compoſing of diſſention in the Church, and they were as meere aſſiſtants, called *ad conſilium*, not *ad conſenſum.*

In 480. yeares after the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtians, Religion, from the firſt to the ſeventh *Conſtantine* there were but fixe generall Counſells called, and thoſe in diſputes of a high nature: all other Lawes were eſtabliſht without Oecumeniall Counſells, by the private inſtruction of ſuch Clergiemen as Emperors beſt liked. The truth is, no univerſall Counſell ever was at all, becauſe there never yet was any univerſall Monarch, or Pope, whoſe power was large enough to call the whole world: but Princes to the utmoſt of their bounds, did in that ſpace of time congregate Biſhops out of all their dominions in thoſe fixe caſes: and yet we do not finde that thoſe fixe Counſels, though they have more reverence,

reverence, yet claymed more power than any other Nationall Synod. Without queſtion no leſſe power than the Emperors could have bin ſufficient to cite, and draw together ſo great a body, or to order them being met, or to continue their meeting, and no leſſe power could animate their decrees with univerſall binding vertue, then the ſame, that ſo convened them. But it is ſufficient, that Counſels have erred, and that appeales have been brought againſt them, and that redreſſe hath beene made by Emperors in other Counſels called for that purpoſe: for this takes away from them that they are either ſupreme, or ſole, or infallible judges of Religion: and this being taken away they cannot be pretended to have any over-ruling ſuperiority, or priviledge above Parliaments. The aſſiſtance of Counſels, and Synods ſcarce any oppoſes, ſo that they be not indeed with an obliging, Legiſlative force above Parliaments, or preferred in power above common conſent, which is the ſoule of all policy and power, and that which preſerves all Churches and States from utter ruine, and confuſion: and this no wiſe man can agree too. So much of the firſt act of power in paſſing, and promulgating of Law; I now come to the ſecond: In giving judgment according to thoſe Lawes. But little need here be ſaid, for if we did yeeld Clergie-men to be the moſt skilfull and knowing Iudges in all matter of doctrine and diſcipline, this is no argument at all, for their ſupremacy, or independency, neither can any difference be ſhewed why ſubordinate power in Eccleſiaſticall judgments ſhould not be as effectual, and juſtifiable, as in temporall, and it is ſufficiently cleered that poly coirany is not to bee received in any Church or Kingdome: and therefore I haſte to the third act of power which conſiſts in uſing compulſory meanes for procuring obedience. If Prieſts had any ſuch ſpirituall ſword, as they pretend, vertuous and efficacious enough to inflict ghoſtly paines upon ſuch as diſobey them, doubtleſſe it would reform as well as confound, and procure obedience, as well as chaſtiſe diſobedience: and then it would as much advance thei-

Empire

Empire, as the temporall ſword doth the Princes. Doubtleſſe it would have ſome ſenſible efficacy, and worke to good ends, and men would not nor could not chuſe but bow, and ſubmit themſelves under it, but now a ſpirituall ſword is pretended, whilſt the gaining of a temporall ſword is intended, and nothing is more plaine to be ſeene. Its not to be wondered at therefore if the people feare not any binding power, where they ſee no looſing, nor regard the ſhutting of thoſe keyes, which cannot open: nor tremble at that thunder, and lightning which is accompanied with no perceiveable vertue of warmth and moyſture, to open and refreſh, as well as to breake, and burne. But I have touched upon this already, and ſo I now leave it.

THe next Argument is taken from the *Iewiſh* policy, for they ſuppoſe that the *Iewiſh* Prieſt-Hood was independent in *Spiritualibus*, and they ſuppoſe that the ſpirituall knowledge and ability of the Prieſts and Levites was the ground of this independency. Here we ſay firſt that there are diverſe reaſons why more power and preeminence was requiſite amongſt the *Iewiſh* Prieſts than is now. *Bilſon* gives foure differences, and I ſhall add two more: for firſt the Prieſts, and Levites were then a great body, they were a twelfth part of *Iſrael*, and had many Cities and their territories wherein they lived a part from other Tribes, and in thoſe Cities and precincts a civill rule was as neceſſary as elswhere and that rule could not be adminiſtred without inequality, and power, and in this they much differed from our Miniſters. Secondly, Prieſts, and Levites were then the onely ſtudied Booke-men and Schollers of that Nation, learning was at a low ebbe, the judiciall as well as the Ceremoniall Lawes were ſcarce knowne, or reade by any but that tribe: and in this the State of our times is farre different. Thirdly, The

Prieſts

Priests and Levites had then a naturall command and signiory in their owne families, over their owne descendents whereas now no such superiority can have place amongst our Clergie-men. Fourthly, The Priests and Levites had then offices of a different nature, some of them were more easie, as to superintend, *&c.* others more toylesome, as to sacrifice, *&c.* some more holy, as to offer incense, *&c.* others more meane, as to slaughter beasts, *&c.* and so different orders were accordingly appointed, but no such difference of service is amongst our Priests in our Churches. I shall adde also fifthly, that there were then many Ceremonies, and Types, and rites of worship, about which many differences might arise hardly to be decided without some appointed Iudges, whereas now the abolition of those externall rudiments, and clogs hath discharged us of all such questions, and scruples in the Church. And sixthly the whole forme of Religious worship was then externally more majesticall, and dreadfull, and it was convenient that some correspondence should bee in pomp, and splendor between the persons which did officiate, and the places wherein they did officiate. As there was a *Sanctum* more inaccessible than the outer Court, and a propitiatory more reverend than either, and as some Altars, and Sacrifices were more solemne, and venerable than others: so it was fit that persons should bee qualified accordingly with extraordinary honor, and priviledge: but this reason now ceases amongst us. There was no inherent holines in that Temple more than is in ours, nor no more internall excellence in those Priests, than in ours: and yet we see an externall splendour was than thought fit for those times, which our Saviour did not seeme to countenance in his Church. The same glittering garments are not now usefull for our Priests, nor the same sanctimonious forbearance, and distance due to our Chancels; and for ought we know all other grandour, and lustre of riches, power, and honour falls under the same reason, but in the next place our answer is, that notwithstanding all these differences which may much more plead for

power and preeminence amongst the *Iewes*, than amongst us, yet we do allow to our *Clergy* more power, and preeminence than was knowne amongst the *Iewes*. There is no colour in Scripture that there were so many Ecclesiasticall Courts in *Iudea*, so thronged with tutors, so pestred with Officers, so choaked up with causes of all kinds, as matrimoniall, testimentary, and many the like: there is no colour, that in so many severall divisions of the Land, besides, ordinary tithes, and indowments, they had any Ecclesiasticall Lords to injoy so many severall Castles, Palaces, Parkes, Manors, *&c.* They had one Miter, we have many. They had one *Priest* richly attired, but with Ornaments that were left for the use of successive generations, we have many, whose bravery is perpetually fresh, and various. *Alexander* might perhaps wonder at the sumptuous habit of one of *Aarons* Successors, but if *Salomon* himselfe should see the Majesticall equipage of diverse of our Arch-Bishops, or *Cardinals*, as they passe from one tribunall to an other; He would think his own Religion simple, and naked to ours. Besides though the *Iewes* had but one High-Priest, in whom was concerned all the State and glory of their Clergie, yet he also was so farre from claymming any independent power, that in the most awfull of Religious affaires, as consulting with God, receiving the Law, building and dedicating the Temple, ordering, and reformming Priests, and their services, making Lawes, and superintending all holy persons, places, and things, in all these things hee was inferior to the *Prince*, not so much as executing the same by subordination. That Scotch Gentleman therefore, which undertakes to prove the independent, unalterable jurisdiction of Bishops, as its now injoyd, and accounted divine in *England*, both from the Law and the Gospell, is as much to be applauded for his confidence, as for his wit.

One Argument more is brought by some *Papists*, to the same purpose, but it is scarce worth repetition. They say, *Ieremy* was but a meane Prophet, yet its written of him, that he was appointed over Nations and Kingdomes, to pull up, to

beare downe, to deſpiſe, *&c.* and they inferre that what a *Prophet* might doe, a *fortiori* a *Prieſt* may doe. But this is not literally ſpoken as true of *Ieremies* own exployts; The *Prophet* was here Gods inſtrument to foretell, and proclaime them, but God had other inſtruments to execute them, and thoſe inſtruments in probability were *Princes*, nor *Prophets*, nor *Prieſts*. *Princes*, *Prophets*, and *Prieſts*, may all be inſtruments of God in the ſame ſervice, yet not all ſerve alike honourably: for wee muſt looke further ſometimes than into the meere names of things, becauſe ſome names of ſervice import the nature of command, and ſome names of command import the nature of ſervice The word, Nurſe, expreſſes ſomething of ſervice, but more of power, and this is fitly applyed ſometimes to *Princes*, for the office of *Princes* is to ſerve thoſe who are ſubject to their power. On the other ſide, the word, Guide, expreſſes ſomthing of power, but more of ſervice, and this may be fitly applyed to *Prieſts* and *Prophets*, for their skill may make them ſerviceable in ſomethings to thoſe which in others are ſerved by them. But I conclude theſe two firſt points, that there is no priviledge either of Sanctity or Knowledge which can exalt *Prieſts*, above *Princes*, or intitle them to that ſpirituall regiment in the Church, which they would faine pretend to. Further at this time I have not leaſure to proceed, I muſt now leave this already ſpoken, and all that which naturally will reſult from it, to the Iudicious.

FINIS.

390/18/41